



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2024 with funding from
Princeton Theological Seminary Library

<https://archive.org/details/viewpoint1715unse>

6755
.17.1

viewpoint



Vol. 17, No. 1

September 28, 1978

A VIEWPOINT ON VIEWPOINT

by The Editor

A seminary journal is unique not only in subjects that it addresses but, more importantly, in the source from which it springs: the fellowship community of Jesus Christ which seeks to respond to Christ's invitation to "Feed My Sheep." The particular step in this people's pilgrimage, the extraordinary character and potential of the community, and the challenging and diverse ramifications of the invitation all merge, simultaneously threatening to engulf the pilgrims and also offering unimaginable possibilities. From this source, a journal may spurt or dribble, flounder or flow, vault with joy or muddle in despair. Moreover, the tension between the intensity of vision possible and actual sin-bound conditions opens wide a ripe new field for lamentation and protest. And, "insofar as Protestantism is a movement of protest, its principle of the kingdom of God is very effective. In the name of the Kingdom, it could challenge the absolute claims of every relative power, particularly the claim of the great colossus which bestrode the medieval world." (H.R. Niebuhr) Protest is exciting, often necessary, and always entrancing to "revolutionaries."

But protest alone deceives like a serpent. In raising the complaint, the protest-ant's eyes easily become seduced into gazing upon the ripe, new fields laid open by the tension rather than the vision of the challenging invitation. Concentration on the awesome--even threatening--possibilities of Christ's Gospel

is diverted into a focus on the sin-laden structures of existence and a protest against them. What was once a pilgrim community living in the tension but walking, stumbling, running, leaping in joy towards the heart-mind-and-soul-absorbing vision of the kingdom has subtly slipped into a people lamenting and lambasting the tension: a Protest-antism.

This seminary journal is meant to be an adventure in the former pathway; in the words of H.R. Niebuhr, an exercise in "constructive Protestantism." Niebuhr maintains that this constructive Protestantism occurs only in a dynamic movement which "needs to go on and on from camp to camp to its meeting with the ever coming kingdom." Based on this conviction that only a constructive Protestantism is worthy of allegiance and that this construction occurs in "the organic movement of those who have been 'called out' and 'sent' ", VIEWPOINT will seek the vigorous diverse dialogue conducive to this movement. We will ask each contributor to dialogue to set forth a responsible contribution which does not merely lament and lambast the "sinful structures of existence" (most people either have "heard it all before" or purposely do not at all want to hear it) but which offers a vision of the kingship of God breaking into these structures "subjected to futility." (Romans 8:20) VIEWPOINT will seek a diversity of artwork, poems and essays which celebrate and lament, illuminate problems and pose resolutions.

In addition, VIEWPOINT itself will continue the movement towards a more responsible, constructive base initiated

(cont. on pg. 2)

CONTENTS

A Viewpoint On Viewpoint
by the Editor

A Welcome or an Introduction?
by Christian T. Iosso

Jesus Comes to America
by Bill Moen

the moment....
by Allison Brown

The Women's Center, 1978-79
by Laurie Ferguson

Forum on the Gospel: Beyond the Looking Glass
by Mark Carlson

1978 Convocation Address: The Minister's Theological Responsibility, Part I
by Dr. Seward Hiltner

Scaffolding and Construction
by John Hogman

Update: The Church in Action at PTS
by the Editor

Viewpoint is an informal journal of frank and creative discussion, published by the students of Princeton Theological Seminary. Essays, poetry, stories, commentary, and graphics are all welcome--though the editor reserves the right not to publish certain contributions. The opinions expressed in Viewpoint are simply those of its contributors, and do not necessarily reflect the official position of the Seminary or of the editorial staff. Issues are published every two weeks with articles submitted by Wednesday of the week before publication. It is best to photostat copies of any material submitted as it tends to get marked up in the process of editing. The Viewpoint Box is in the administration building.

Poetry may be required to meet higher standards of acceptability since it is not easily edited and consumes disproportionate space. Suggestions,

contributions, or mere interest may be directed to the Viewpoint box or the more informal and welcome setting of 402 Alexander (residence of the editor). The shape and content of each issue is not rigidly limited to what it has been in the past, is now in this issue or in this editor's mind. Got ideas? Suggest them.

(cont. from pg. 1)

by Chris Iosso, last year's editor. It will move away from ultimately inadequate crisis management in both the operation and the content of the journal. In reference to operation, established, regular columns will be encouraged in order to give structure to the journal rather than relying totally upon the personal charisma of each year's editor. And in reference to the content, VIEWPOINT will continue to cover the "crisis" or particular seminary issues because: 1) in the words of that ancient philosopher Christian Iosso, "an unexamined seminary is not worth attending" and faculty, administration, and students are all responsible for its examination, and 2) responsible commentary on the training of men and women for the ministry must be responsible for this seminary's training, these men and women, and this concrete ministry or wallow in irresponsibility and irrelevancy. However, VIEWPOINT will widen its focus beyond the "crises" of this seminary and these three years to include non-crisis issues. A new, regular column on the general subject of the gospel hopefully will exemplify the movements away from crisis management in both operation and subject.

VIEWPOINT looks forward to a year punctuated with creativity and construction. May our searching examinations of seminary and church life be outshone only and always by our search for the exciting possibilities of our "meeting with the ever coming kingdom."

Editor & Associates: Mark Carlson, John Hogman, Mark Durrett, Greg Hall, Paul Roch. New blood in this issue: Bill Moen

(cont.- please see bottom of pg. 13)

A WELCOME OR AN INTRODUCTION?

BY Christian T. Iosso

(Our honorable student government chairperson and former editor of VIEWPOINT, Chris Iosso, telegraphs this short piece from Oakland, Calif. Hopefully, when Chris arrives in body as well as soul, he will appear frequently on these pages, elaborating more fully on the cultivation of healthy critical distance and suggesting positive action in the growth of the seminary.)

"Every academic institution has its own personality" began last year's edition of a pamphlet called Survival Kit for New Students - #2. The aim of the two booklets by that name was to provide a more practical and informal guide to the seminary than that given in either the catalogue or the handbook. Last year's Survival Kit was put together by Michelle Dungee, the former head of the Student Government. I too hope that you will manage to pick up alot of handy information on the Princeton-Trenton area fairly quickly, but will leave that to your own explorations. This article stems from a different hope--that you may not wish to adjust your personality entirely to this seminary's particular personality.

Over the years, for instance, students have expressed dissatisfaction with the Orientation process, finding that it does little to prepare anybody for the issues, the tensions, and the problems that most seminarians eventually go through. You may expect to deal with issues concerning the historical-critical study of the scriptures, as people have been for most of this century. You will probably not be told, though, about how painful it may be to confront liberation issues, women's concerns, or gay theology--or how complicated these social justice items can get on a seminary campus. Not that there is that much pluralism of faith-worlds here, but what there is isn't generally encouraged--and is virtually suppressed in the seminary's outside-oriented publicity.

As for tensions, these come in two basic varieties, personal and institutional: The chief difficulty lies in sorting the two out. In the case of the first type of tension, it may be helpful to know that a large number of seminarians seek counseling of some form. Many remain embarrassed by this, or afraid of the numbers participating, but aside from the substantial benefits involved, the question has to do with the influence of the seminary involvement on this situation.

In the second area of tensions some factors are fairly obvious: the centralization of power in the hands of the president, the relative impotence of students and faculty. Princeton was once a fairly small but strife-torn place, administrative structures have remained virtually unchanged since that time. There are two less obvious elements involved though: 1) all aspects of structural change involve personalities--more so than in larger scale politics--and; 2) students find it hard to organize for any long term strategies, particularly here where student turnover is high (or rapid).

Exploring the problems you will encounter is your business; I hope you didn't want a booklet on how to mix pleasure with business. I would join the editor of the VIEWPOINT in suggesting that it may be helpful to share insights and concerns in these pages. You are also invited, of course, to work with the Student Government--for and on the seminary, the church and the world. Just as the language of presence can obscure the dialectic between concealment and revelation, and that of acceptance the dynamic of judgement and grace, so you may find the seminary's language of church leadership concealing an analysis of power and authority. This last is at least partly the students' responsibility.

JESUS COMES TO AMERICA

by Bill Moen

"Now look you guys, I'm the Son of God, and I'll call the shots around here." Leaning across his huge imported teakwood desk, puffing on an expensive meerschaum, Jesus glared at his bickering disciples who were eternally quibbling over who would take over the business when the time came

for the Boss to leave. Peter, who had been the instigator of this childish outbreak, straightened his tie and sneered at Mark who was working on a book that Peter knew would certainly show him in an unfavorable light. The other disciples squirmed nervously in their comfortable leather chairs keeping their eyes uncomfortably fixed on their angry leader who had had just about enough of their churlish behavior.

"I'm not dead yet!" Jesus continued, "and I'm not giving up while there's a ghost of a chance of succeeding. So just relax and let's get this job done and later we'll see who gets the keys to what." Jesus paused until there was complete silence.

"I hope that none of you have forgotten the reasons why I have specifically chosen you twelve for this unique venture. America, as you know, is a big country and I realized from the beginning that it would take big, influential men like you to really make an impact on this great land. Men like Luke here, a Harvard graduate and president of the AMA whose work it has been to verify and promote my healing ministry ...and Peter, whose task it has been as a leading labor union official to convince the working masses that my yoke is indeed light, and Matthew who has been working diligently in Washington, promoting Presidential prayer breakfasts, Congressional Bible studies and the like. I know you are all experts in your respective fields; you all have excellent credentials, but there will be no bonuses, no earthly rewards, and no golden crowns until I see some results!"

"But Lord!" Peter interrupted with a twinge of desperation in his voice, "We've tried everything, but these people are hard! They just won't get saved. We've saturated the entire country with billboards promising them life and toll-free numbers. We've got our own television stations with tasteful and attractive programming. We've got our own gospel rock groups that perform for nothing. What more could they want?"

"Okay, Okay, Peter," Jesus replied, "we've all heard your sob story before. You'll never get to the top with an attitude like that."

The boss, frowning more noticeably than usual, glanced at his Rolex, and sunk back slowly into the cushions of his chair. Through the large, clean office window directly behind him the smoggy skyline of New York City itched its bleary lines across the nearby horizon. Before him, the desk was strewn with the carefully compiled progress reports detailing the activities of GodCo's first year in business. Needless to say, the corporation was not as successful as the Owner/Founder/President had hoped. Unaccustomed to the taste of defeat, Jesus knew there must be a way.

"There must be an angle we've missed, some phrase we've left unturned, some gimmick we've overlooked that will convert them to our product. Are you all sure that you've not wasted any talents or is this the best you can do? Come on, dig!" Puffing anxiously at his pipe, Jesus glanced hopefully from disciple to disciple.

Thomas, who was always somewhat skeptical, could restrain himself no longer. "This has gone far enough," he exclaimed jumping to his feet. "No doubt you gentlemen still believe in this Salvation stuff, but after all this time of pushing and thinking positive all we have is a bunch of church buildings and bumper stickers."

"Thomas, you always exaggerate," Peter cut in. "And besides they really are nice buildings. But not only that, there's one for everyone. There's churches with huge and impressive steeples, but also churches that have folding chairs, or have pews if you want...Churches with or without choir lofts, churches with inspiring fountains and hanging gardens, churches with huge organs or churches with no instruments at all. In fact, you name it, we've got it...anything from tennis courts to indoor saunas."

"That's right, Peter, we've made Salvation just about as convenient as anyone could possibly expect," agreed Matthew. "Why between 'Dial-a-Prayer' and drive-in churches they are unquestionably without excuse!"

"Not to mention enumerable attractive and tasteful revolving neon signs proclaiming

the Good News that 'Jesus Saves'!" added John. "And that's not all. Why, right now in the planning stages we have Gospel vending machines that someday will save untold thousands of hours of work, and thereby freeing our followers for more productive activity. Also there is a new chain of Gospel snack-bars operated exclusively by born-again Christians which is scheduled to begin a trial run in Southern California.

"Thank you, John," Jesus interrupted, "but I believe we discussed all of this at our last meeting. What we need now is a NEW approach, something fresh, something that goes beyond cliché, yet with universal appeal."

Smoothly sliding back the coatsleeve of his custom-tailored Brooks Bros. suit-coat, Jesus glanced once again at his wristwatch and murmured something inaudible about 'time' and 'money.' Not that money was all that hard to come by. Being the omniscient Son of God, Jesus had made a phenomenal killing in the stock market which had of course won him an unusual number of converts on Wall Street. Several months later in an exclusive Newsweek interview Jesus had delivered what was later dubbed, "The sermon from the top." In this "sermon" Jesus explained that any American, regardless of race or socio-economic background, could enjoy the same level of success if they would only accept his way. "Consider the lilies of the field," he had said, "they neither toil nor spin and where has that gotten them?" Accompanying his words was a full-color three page spread depicting the unrivalled opulence of his Hollywood mansion. There were shots of the tennis courts, luxurious servants quarters, and the Olympic swimming pool replete with bikini-clad models cavorting and smiling with the disciples. There was a photo of the gorgeous master bedroom done completely in purple velvet and even an engaging close-up of the master himself sitting in his custom 450 SEL with the familiar YESHUA license plates. This cover story along with his whirlwind series of public appearances had won him national notoriety. He had, in fact, been hailed the king of Superstars.

But still he was frustrated. Time was running out and there were still

hundreds of thousands who had not yet "seen the light." How would they be reached in time? It was a nagging question. What more could they want? What could it be? He had offered them everything he could see they desired. But so few had gone for it. Wealth, power, prestige...fun...all those things this country loved and cherished he had offered them, even proving by his own lifestyle how easy it was to get them.

The disciples were getting restless. Luke was fidgeting with his briefcase. Matthew was absentmindedly punching the buttons of his pocket calculator and Peter was picking another verbal fight with Thomas. "This is enough to try the patience of a saint," Jesus thought to himself.

"Well, if no one has any more ideas, I suppose we might as well adjourn this meeting. I can see we aren't going to get anywhere this way."

With a unanimous sigh of relief that filled the room, the disciples all began packing their briefcases, shuffling papers and leaving, heading for the door one by one, bidding each other 'good night' in deceptively warm and enthusiastic tones belying the agitation and frustration that had only minutes before prevailed. Matthew and Peter left together discussing dinner plans and trying to decide whether to take Matthew's Porsche or Peter's Mark IV.

"I'll tell you what, Mat," Peter said, "you wash my feet and I'll wash yours. You buy dinner and I'll do the driving." And then they disappeared behind closing elevator doors.

Meanwhile Jesus was shaking hands and saying good-bye to the last few disciples who had taken more time leaving. Judas, who always had the largest collection of paperwork and project reports was the last man out the door, perhaps hoping to be first, and always trying to make that one important impression that would win him the corporate presidency someday.

"Boss, I've been thinking this afternoon," he began, stopping in the doorway and turning to address Jesus, "There is one thing we haven't tried that just might sell them."

Looking up suddenly, surprised at an undaunted disciple still trying to come up with something, Jesus gazed expectantly into Judas' dancing eyes. After a pause he asked, "Well, what is it?"

Judas looked down at his brief-case for a moment and before looking up began. "People, it would appear, are always looking for something for nothing but actually, if something is free, they figure it must be worthless. Or else there must be a catch. And so my point is this: if we charge some outrageous fee for Salvation instead of just giving it away, chances are it will move like hotcakes. In no time at all, we'll be bigger than IBM!"

With a sweeping gesture of his arm and a devilish glint in his eye, Judas concluded his words and stood quietly awaiting the Lord's reply.

Awed by the fact that he had never thought of it, and awed by the audacious notion of selling Salvation, Jesus just sat there, momentarily dumbfounded.

"You know, Judas," he said at length, "I think you've got something there."

(Bill Moen is something of a peripatetic miscreant who comes here from Arizona, as much to cause trouble as to study... apparently. In light of the present article, we hope he does not drive a Mark IV or a Mercedes. Those of you who think you've heard this before, rest assured that Bill, being only a junior, hasn't actually read Bonhoeffer yet.)

the moment.....

the moment
it comes
it goes
if only it would stay...
but then complacency
then independence and apathy.

the tension
the tension between despair and
happiness

must be the place,
the place of rest,
but such is paradox.
Can it be?
Can such a state exist?

Yes... No...
I will not have it so.
I must
I must yield
I must accept it

the way it is
such despair and nothingness.
But how?
it is painful... agony in fact.

the God/man
the Absolute Paradox
endured the painfulness of it all.
No resentment. No anger.
all in love-
in love? But how?
Ah! Such a mystery it is...

Me to Him-
is such union possible?
it is a possibility...
it is the Moment?
No, the Choice
the choice is mine.
But can I make it?
Can I? Can I?
Do I want to?

Costly grace:
can it be
the dialectic of eternity?
the God/man
the Absolute paradox
there beyond the cliff,
beyond despair, yet maybe not...
for me to choose or reject.
which will it be?

the moment?
the leap:
the decision to accept my despair,
the will to wait in silence for the
God/man
only to lift my heart and head and
hands
in praise of him,
the Absolute Paradox.
Ah! the Moment....

Allison Brown, '78

THE WOMEN'S CENTER, 1978-79

by Laurie Ferguson, Coordinator

(VIEWPOINT is privileged to have the Women's Center's new coordinator, Laurie Ferguson, reveal a few glimpses of what God's invitation to "freedom and wholeness" means in concrete actions at PTS.)

The Women's Center was created in 1972-73 to minister to the unique needs of the women in the seminary community. Although our numbers have increased since then, women are still in a special position, both in this seminary and in the church at large. Recognizing that, the Women's Center this year is attempting to identify some of the concerns that are peculiar to women here, and find ways of meeting those needs. That means we have to be able to talk with one another about our concerns, our ideas and our interests. So there is automatically an agenda for the first meeting of the Women's Center! It will be Thursday night, Sept. 28. We will begin with a worship service in Miller Chapel at 7:30 p.m. so we can pray for one another and the year to come. Then we will move to the Center which is in basement of Stuart Hall to meet the members of the board and talk about some of the programs we've begun over the summer as well as brainstorming for the fall and spring.

Women have been involved in many different areas in the past years. Examples would be faculty hiring interviews, curriculum committees, inclusive language, educational programs, advocacy in the church, alternative worship resources, and battered women counseling. We are hoping to begin a free babysitting center once a week for seminary spouses to leave their children. There will also be opportunities for support groups, and dialogue groups with women and men who are interested.

The Center is officially "run" (a very loose term!) by a board of women who are willing to commit time to the center and the coordinator. The women who are serving on the board this year are: Meg Barnhouse, Brenda Biggs, Sarah Foulger, Janet Hellner, Catharine Grier, Sherry Jones, Jan Maatman, Sue Reisinger, Bitsey Shaw, and Debra Shovelin. Hopefully some junior women and wives will want to

get involved once the semester gets underway.

This is far from a composite picture of the Center, but the Center is not really programs or events. God has called us all to freedom and wholeness. We need to be able to experience that here. The vision that the women's Center has for the campus and the church can be a means of reaching that goal. Hopefully the spirit of community between the women who are working together, and the growth and understanding in our relationships with one another, women and men, will be the evidence of the Women Center's presence on this campus.

FORUM ON THE GOSPEL: BEYOND THE LOOKING GLASS

by Mark Carlson

Church growth is a big issue these days. Nearly everyone is worried about it. Nearly every denomination is studying it. Why do "those" churches grow but we don't? Many people have answers, but their answers are so many and so divergent that those who don't have the answers feel like Alice in Wonderland, looking at unknown doors and golden keys, bottles which say "Drink me" and make us shrink or pieces of cake which say "Eat me" and make us stretch. Is this the right passageway or are we going further underground? How do we keep our theological reflection on church growth from disintegrating into "Alice in Wonderland, Part II?"

I wish to pose a guideline: a theological question demands a theological response. All sociological analyses and ecclesiastical machinations will not solve the real problem of church growth.

Admittedly, 'church growth' can be had by merely studying the social and ecclesiastical characteristics of the growing churches and then recommend copying those characteristics in other churches. The major portion of the UPC of USA report on membership trends did just that. The church is an institution among other institutions and can be studied and programmed as such with success: witness Robert Schuller's 'church' growth based on his "Seven Principles of Successful Retailing"

(accessibility, surplus parking, inventory, service, visibility, possibility thinking and good cash flow). Is this the church growth we want?

Admittedly again, all theological movements will produce profound sociological and church-administration ramifications. In fact, any theological movement must be embodied in social and ecclesiastical transformation or be irrelevant. But these sociological and administrative embodiments are secondary. Any movement towards church growth based merely on studies of currently growing churches and on recommendation of corresponding administrative changes will always be hollow and superficial. In the crude words of Martin Luther, "Here a bungling jackass of a sophist looks only at the outward appearance of the work, as a cow looks at a new gate." (Comm. on Gal. 3:10).

In addition to their being secondary, these studies which follow the white rabbits who look at their pocket-watches, say, "I'm late. I'm late, for a very important date," and appear to go somewhere can be either a problem themselves or a reflection of the problem. That study recommendations can cause problems is no secret: Dean Kelley's book "Why Conservative Churches Are Growing", critiqued in Chapel last year by Dr. McCord as being a book which more often compiles the wrong reasons why conservative churches are growing is a case in point. (It is interesting to see how much Kelley looks to sociologists to find his "Indispensable Function of Religion.")

But even the most scrupulous studies inevitably comprise, in part, a mirror of the problem. Take for example the UPUSA report's number one recommendation for "Stronger Pastoral Leadership" based on an opinion survey of different congregations' satisfaction with the pastor. Strong leadership is undeniably a prime prerequisite for a healthy church body and I agree whole-heartedly with every endeavor to upgrade seminary training. But is it not, in part, a mirror of the real church problem that so much emphasis must be placed on the pastor's personal ability? Where the church as a grass-roots lay body is in a quandry, we can only expect that churches with pastors who have a "high capacity to generate

enthusiasm, the warmth, spiritual authenticity, and competence" will grow faster than churches without those pastors. Recommending stronger "procedures for recruiting, training, and guiding ministers" is then, like recommending a stronger grip adjustment to a golfer who has a slice caused by poor body movement: the ball won't slice but because the error of a hooking hand grip now counter-balances the error of a slicing body motion. Theologically, the report's recommendation is questionable because it lays too much emphasis on the personal charisma of the pastor rather than viewing the pastorate as an office of the church and the church as a community led by Christ.

Let us assume, however, that the UPUSA report is right (as it may be) in recommending: 1) Stronger Pastoral Leadership; 2) Stronger and Fuller Program in Most Areas of Church Life; 3) More Responsibility for Membership Recruitment by Session and Members; 4) Greater Percentage of Members Attending; "etc." How could we accomplish these things? We cannot command a greater percentage of members to attend. If we cannot drive people to church with a stick, is it ethical to seduce them to church with carrots? However correct, brilliant or divinely inspired these recommendations may be, they alone are powerless to make a languid, dying congregation spurt with vigorous, lively growth. How do we get beyond analysis by looking-glass?

The guidelines proposed at the beginning hopefully can provide some direction in our endeavor: the growth of the Christ's church is primarily a theological conversation which demands theological response. Or, if we return to Luther's quote, "David's (or in this case, the Church's) 'doing' is neither a natural doing nor a moral doing; it is a doing in faith." The natural analyses of sociology and the advanced recommendations of ecclesiastical reports do not attack the core issue and are powerless without "the power of God for salvation to everyone who has faith." In Romans 1:16, one of the most fundamental theological statements in all Pauline literature, Paul states that the Gospel is that power. Without it, all attempts at church growth through whatever means will be as successful as constructing the Chesire cat from his smile (or in Luther's

metaphor, like growing the fruit without the tree). Unfortunately, we have allowed the Gospel and salvation to become so individualized, 'religi-cized' and spiritualized that in the concrete, community matter of the growth of the Church we pass lightly over it, while denominations which preach an individualized, religicized, spiritualized salvation, milk it for all its worth.

Now, responding theologically to the issue of church growth may not necessarily lead to more people in the pews. In fact, preaching a full gospel--my sample suggestion--is usually confronted with persecution, as well as the formation of a community of believers. But if the mainline church is to reach out across the formidable barriers of class, ethnicity and suburban/urbanism--as it must, if it is to grow--it will find its greatest resource in the transforming and life-giving power of the Gospel rather than in its own fine sociological analyses or intelligent ecclesiastical machinations.

* * *

This is the first article in a full column on "The Gospel Today." All students, faculty and emeriti are strongly encouraged to present their comments on the gospel and its related subjects of evangelism, mission and preaching. Hopefully, someone can reflect theologically on such questions as: If, as Liberation theologians believe, we at PTS cannot preach a gospel of liberation to our overwhelming white, middle-class churches, what gospel can we preach? Can the white, middle-class mainline churches preach "good news" to the oppressed without being hypocritical or pacifying? What do we do when "things today in the worldwide mission of the church are so different, so unexciting, and so unimaginative" (Hugh T. Kerr)? What does the gospel mean or challenge our meaning today?

* * * * *

1978 CONVOCATION ADDRESS: THE MINISTER'S THEOLOGICAL RESPONSIBILITY, PART I

by Dr. Seward Hiltner

Three factors in my experience of recent years have led me to focus this discussion on the minister's theological responsibility. These are, first, my work in the Doctor of Ministry program; second, some recent acquaintance with the standard examination in theology of the United Presbyterian Church; and third, my efforts in several courses to teach the theological dimensions of pastoral care.

In the D. Min. program it was soon discovered that this generally able and talented group of ministers had done very little to cultivate theological reflection on their actual experiences of ministry. Whether the ministry event under consideration was a pastoral call, a sermon, the course of a meeting, or a stewardship campaign, the theological comments about it tended toward superficiality in most instances, and sometimes even to irrelevance. If the event reported was a pastoral call on some one who appeared resistive to help, the theological remarks might be only that the person needed love, or to accept the love of God in Jesus Christ. Seldom was the theological understanding of love used to show exactly why such human resistances are so deep and difficult to overcome. When I made such a point in a workshop discussion, the ministers seemed glad to have it. But the next report was likely to be little better theologically than the first. I came to assume, therefore, that we were dealing not mainly with lack of knowledge but with resistance, a kind of resistance that the persons themselves did not know they had.

Later experience has tended to confirm this theory. Somehow and somewhere most ministers have come to regard theology as a kind of magic helper, usually elusive, but capable of reinforcing one's ministry efforts if only one can hit on the correct positive note. The fact is of course that bringing to bear on a situation the most relevant theological insights may show that what one has been attempting needs not reinforcement but criticism. It is significant that several of these ministers

I have known have begun to gain ability to reflect theologically on their experiences only after being shaken by a reflection of this kind emerging in a workshop discussion.

The second factor that has influenced my choice of topic is the standard Presbyterian examination in theology. In this examination the questions are posed in situational form. The candidate is not evaluated in terms of the theological content of his or her position, but for ability to relate theological resources or issues to the situation as described. Let me suggest the principles that seem to be operating here.

First, the candidate's theological ability is distinguished from any type of predetermined content position. Concomitantly, the freedom to take one position or another is not regarded as antithetical to theological ability. No doubt some positions taken by candidates strain the patience of examiners. But so long as a candidate seems to be on the road to some kind of Christian position, that effort is respected; and what is measured is the candidate's awareness of the resources being used in the process.

Second, when asked to articulate something of a theological nature that may shed light on the situation posed, the candidate is free to select his or her theological data from biblical, doctrinal, ethical, historical or other sources depending on his or her judgment of their relevance. At least in principle, this view renounces the notion that there is some master theological discipline from which all others are derivative. Thus the multiperspectival nature of theology itself seems to be espoused.

The third factor leading me to this topic has been my own teaching experience in pastoral care, attempting to help students to relate theological resources and issues to their experiences in pastoral care. To make progress along this line, I have found that there is no substitute for theological analysis of the student's own reports. From these teaching experiences let me add only one point of insight, namely, helping the student to a proper relationship between involvement and reflection.

Some students in pastoral care are inclined to believe, at first, that if theology is relevant then it follows that there will be a theological talk with the parishioner. Since that may sometimes be true, I am of course careful not to negate the idea entirely. But the fact is that theological reflection by the student is of great importance even when it may not at this time be appropriate to have explicit God talk with the parishioner. Understanding this is not easy for some students. They may have caught a vision of what it means to begin to help another human being. So they are tempted to over-value involvement. To stand aside and detached, and to ask from theological perspectives just what has taken place, may appear cold as against the warmth of the actual relationship. But it may be just as important for long term helping to become a reality.

All Christians have a ministry, not only those who are ordained or professional, and that ministry includes some kind and degree of theological responsibility. But if the "pastoral directors," as H. Richard Niebuhr called them, are not exercising theological responsibility, it is altogether likely that no one is.

The discussion will be in three sections. First, what theological responsibility means. Second, the nature of the minister's theological responsibility. Third, the Seminary's task in fostering theological responsibility among ministers.

I

The prerequisite to theology is a community of faith. Without the community, reflection would be philosophy not theology. Without the faith, it could as easily be detachment as commitment.

A community of faith does not, however, automatically produce theology. It may only restate its heritage in the language that appeared at the time of its formation. Theology appears only when two additional steps are undertaken: first, translation of the heritage across time and circumstance; second, seriously inquiring about possible discrepancies between the basic faith and interpretations put upon it in the interim. When all three processes are in operation, there is theology.

Appropriate translation requires some degree of expert knowledge; but its touchstone is the involvement/detachment tension already noted. Understanding of a biblical text should be within its own frame of reference, historical circumstances, and author's bent. Granted the intent of the text in its own setting, however, is there clarifying explanation of how, if at all, that point transcends time and circumstance? If the topic is Jesus Christ as God/man in the formula of Chalcedon, is there attempt to show the values that the Chalcedonian Council was trying to protect in face of inevitably serious criticisms of the adequacy of Chalcedonian language for today's understanding of Jesus Christ?

Let me go one step further with the formula of Chalcedon, especially since a good deal of recent work on Christology has tried to translate it in new ways. Although some of these efforts are more promising than others, none has won much acceptance. In my opinion, most of the new formulations tend to take too lightly the inherently paradoxical nature of the Chalcedonian intent. A real paradox may be clarified but it cannot be solved or eliminated. Over-emphasis on detachment may take the paradox too lightly. On the other side, over-emphasis on involvement may resist entirely the effort to translate Chalcedon into terms that are comprehensible today.

The third ingredient needed to produce theology by a community of faith is inquiry, which proceeds both by critique and construction. While respecting the faith, its critique expresses skepticism about the understanding of the faith on the part both of our ancestors and ourselves. The construction is partly translation as already described, but also testing the faith against contemporary circumstances, which may in important respects be different from those of the past. In inquiry also there is properly a tension between involvement and detachment. Over-involvement destroys serious inquiry, but a focus on detachment alone may forget that even the most rigorous inquiry is undertaken within the context of a community of faith.

If theology is a reflective activity

of the community of faith that includes appreciation, translation, and inquiry, what, then, is theological responsibility within that community? I suggest that it means a proper exercise of all three of these functions at all times, even when there appear on occasion to be severe tensions among them.

It is clear that a community lacking appreciation of what is central in its heritage could have, at best, an episodic kind of theology with no clear criteria for curbing its eclecticism. It would, therefore, lack responsibility in relation to its heritage. If a community valued its faith and heritage, but denigrated the need for translation of it for contemporary understanding, it would invite a combination of obscuratism and idolatry. And if both heritage and translation were taken seriously, but inquiry shunted aside, it would not be long until the test of faith became believing six impossible things before breakfast, as Lewis Carroll put it. In such situations, theological responsibility would be subverted by selective inattention to ingredients that are essential to theology itself.

The actual exercise of theological responsibility by a community, however, is not guaranteed by the fact that some attention is paid to all the principal factors. So long as they seem to be mutually reinforcing, that may appear to be true. But what happens when they are in conflict? The nineteenth century's controversies over slavery illustrate this situation. The New Testament discussion of slavery as an institution is, at best, equivocal. Should it be translated to mean subservience by slaves? Or would critical inquiry question the very base of slavery as an institution? There appear to be occasions when theological responsibility requires that inquiry win over heritage and translation, as the latter have previously been conceived. After the battle, however, there needs to be reconception of the heritage and a new framework for its translation. Today's liberation theologies regard themselves as at a similar polemical point in the struggle. Whether they can win a victory, as did the opponents of slavery, and then return to appreciation and translation of the heritage, remains to be seen.

There are no general and infallible standards by which we can judge the degree to which a community is exercising theological responsibility. It is clear, however, that such standards must be equally aware of the specific needs in the actual contemporary situation and of the basic message of the faith.

.....To Be Continued in Next Issue

SCAFFOLDING AND CONSTRUCTION

by John Hogman

Our return/arrival to Princeton always carries the special promise and apprehensions embodied in who we are and what we seek to be and do. The most crucial of these tensions of promise and apprehension revolves around the common purpose we share - the development of a substantial and creative awareness of the call of God to His Church and our response to it. This purpose permeates our life together and to come to grips with the breadth of its implications for our common life as students in the coming year I would like to share a story with you.

I

There was once a village in which the people were very proud of their cathedral. However, over the course of the years it had fallen into a state of serious disrepair. This sparked off a great debate as to the appropriate response of the community. There were those who denied there was any problem at all insisting that what people saw as defects were in fact just a result of the observers blood shot eyes. Some others rather delighted in the prospect of having the whole edifice crumble to dust so they could create a rock garden on the site. A third group sought the reconstruction of the cathedral along traditional lines with serious attention being paid to modern considerations of style and construction. As is usual in things such as this, the third option prevailed as much because of default as anything else.

The task was finally engaged but it soon became apparent there were a variety of approaches to how the construction should proceed. In fact the most amazing debate ensued concerning the extent of scaffolding necessary for the reconstruction. One group chose to proceed with reconstruction without any scaffolding at all considering it superfluous. They appeared to make considerable progress in a rather short period of time but it was soon apparent they would only accomplish a limited amount. A second group perceived the need for the most elaborate forms of scaffolding and refused to proceed until it was all in place. A great deal of time was spent discussing the sort of carvings that should adorn the scaffolding but little ever seemed to be actually accomplished on the cathedral structure itself.

There was however, a number of persons who sought to balance their time between working on the scaffolding and the task of reconstruction....They realized the scaffolding was necessary for the reconstructive task but were nevertheless aware in the end the cathedral and not the scaffolding was their primary responsibility.

II

On this campus and in the Church which it seeks to serve our reconstructive task is the development of a substantial, creative and articulate awareness of the call of God to His Church and of the necessity of our response individually and collectively. If, however, this community is to fulfill this function, it needs to maintain the scaffolding to facilitate the actual reconstructive work.

There has been considerable debate among students about the extent of effort to be expended on theological construction and community scaffolding. It is only because of the efforts of those who chose (and continue to choose) to spend time on the scaffolding that the constructive task can be pursued on this campus in a way in which it could not be just a year ago (certainly a year and a half ago). It is however important to note scaffolding efforts though necessary do not themselves accomplish the reconstructive task. We must go beyond the creation of facilitative mechanisms on campus to proceed to reconstruction to the extent permitted by the

present state of scaffolding. Of course, we are always seeking to extend and maintain our facilitative mechanisms when and wherever possible.

As an observer of the present campus scene there appears to be some areas of real reconstructive promise. These include Social Action, Women's Center, and the International Students. All of these groups have established (at various degrees of personal cost) the necessary scaffolding to actually aid the whole community in the reconstructive task of coming to grips with the call of God to the Church. It remains, in varying degrees, for their promise to become actualities. It is also hoped that the Trenton project which has met surprising growth in numbers would also be able to exercise greater responsibility of witness towards the campus.

In other areas of student life, there is as yet insufficient scaffolding for any great amount of constructive accomplishment. The area of Black Studies on this campus remains the most blatant and obvious example. Without a more concentrated investment of time and money this seminary will continue to be denied the real constructive contribution that should be emerging from the drama of the Black encounter with the God of Israel.

It is also important that the crucial scaffolding of funded positions for Women's Center Coordinator, A.B.S. and I.S.A. presidents and Student Government Chairperson be maintained or built. We must also ensure that the facilitative mechanisms of student participation on Student-Faculty Committees be maintained and that the newly instituted Student-Trustee Committee be used creatively and maintained.

As students facing the task of this community and our responsibility in the task we must creatively balance our efforts on scaffolding and construction so as to maximize results. To ignore the necessity of scaffolding will make serious construction impossible. To spend all our time on the scaffolding will likewise ensure that the constructive task is ignored and it is for this task we find ourselves here in the first place.

UPDATE: THE CHURCH IN ACTION AT PTS

by the Editor

The ground-breaking proposal for Black Studies (which would "afford the opportunity for all students to study the black experience as a basic component of a theological education") has survived the summer and still presents promise for broader ecumenical theological education. The next issue of VIEWPOINT will contain a full report on the crucial stage of this proposal.

A substantial step towards involvement of students in the total seminary responsibilities was achieved when the first meeting of five trustees and five students (mainly from student government) was arranged for early October. Seminary investment responsibilities will be among the topics discussed. (Due to neutral, logistical difficulties, our student representative was not able to review the seminary's investment portfolio during the summer.)

President McCord has approved the initial appointments for student-faculty committees. Sign-up sheets for the limited number of remaining positions will be posted. Student representatives to the committees will participate in an orientation program and be held with stricter accountability to the student body (through student government or VIEWPOINT).

The status of the proposal for a seminary chaplain is unknown presently. Meanwhile, steps to beef-up the deacon system have been taken.

Look for a new face on VIEWPOINT next issue. Until then, write your poetry, submit your essays, send your 'letters to the editor', create your stories, experiment with your artwork, reflect theologically or even pass on some comics.

A final note: le chat de Hodge Hall has a face-lift itself worthy of note. We wonder, also, who was so kind as to give the Rattus a new coat for the cold weather the day after G.A.

(cont. from pg. 2, Editor & Associates - Associates are expected to be involved in two or more issues yearly. VIEWPOINT has absolutely no intention to win the "Most Racist, Sexist Organization on Campus" Award: VIEWPOINT works closely with the Women's Center, A.B.S. and I.S.A. and desires fulltime associates from each group. Unfortunately these desires could not be met. Anyone

viewpoint

Vol. 17, No. 2

October 16, 1978

JAWS III

BY George "Yorgos" Cladis

I was elected with Sandy Brawders to represent the Seminary Delegation on the 180th General Assembly's (UPCUSA) Issues Committee on "Homosexuality and the Church." By this time you have undoubtedly studied this issue from biblical, theological, moral, etc., perspectives and you have probably wound up with the same opinion you had before your study only it is now tinselized with more educated words and models. I will not attempt to persuade you one way or the other; I am not a good enough thinker or writer to do so and, even if I were, I probably would not persuade you to a new view anyway. I would simply like to make some observations concerning my experience on that committee.

An ocean full of articles, books, journals, memorandums and rest-room stalls have been written attempting to clarify and define the nature of homosexuality. One might believe, as I did, that this was one of the central questions we faced. However, the committee, and the General Assembly at large, decided a more crucial issue was 'at stake': "Therefore it appears that what is really important is not what homosexuality is, but what we believe about it." (The Committee's Report, Para. 12).

This approach is most curious. Especially when you consider that the overwhelming majority of the committee and assembly were of a conservative "evangelical" persuasion who adamantly stressed the historical Jesus: "Just because I believe in Zeus doesn't make him real; our evangelical belief is founded on the historical nature of the Christ Event." Yet, oddly enough, these folks momentarily became compadres of of brother Tillich to stress belief over nature as the

(cont. pg. 2)

CONTENTS - Part IJaws III

by George "Yorgos" Cladis

The Minister's Theological
Responsibility, Part II

by Seward Hiltner

UntitledA Letter to Jim Wallis

by John Hogman

Forum on the Gospel: A Dynamic
Faith

by Gregory Hall

A Preface to South Africa

by Bob Davis

Part II

An Open Letter to Juniors

by John Wilbur

Is P.T.S. An Old Wineskin?

by Chris Iosso

Update

by Sharon Esposito

Poem

by W.D. Moen

Viewpoint is an informal journal of frank and creative discussion, published by the students of Princeton Theological Seminary. Essays, poetry, stories, commentary, and graphics are all welcome--though the editor reserves the right not to publish certain contributions. The opinions expressed in Viewpoint are simply those of its contributors and do not necessarily reflect the official position of the Seminary or of the editorial staff. Issues are published every two weeks with articles submitted by Wednesday of the week before publication. It is best to photostat copies of any material submitted as it tends to get marked up in the process of editing. The Viewpoint Box is in the administration building.

Poetry may be required to meet higher standards of acceptability since it is not easily edited and consumes disproportionate space. Suggestions, contributions, or mere interest may be directed to the Viewpoint box or the more informal and welcome setting of 402 Alexander Hall (residence of the editor). The shape and content of each issue is not rigidly limited to what it has been in the past, is now in this issue or in this editor's mind. Got ideas? Suggest them.

Editor & Senior Associates:

Mark Carlson, John Hogman, Mark Durre

Other Associates:

Paul Rack, W.D. Moen, Gregory Hall

Cont. from page 1 -

central variable in deciding the homosexual question.

Imagine a "good ol' boy" in the back bayous of Louisiana taking his son to get some New Orleans gumbo when they pass a carnival and, for the first time, see an elephant. The father and his son mistake the elephant's leg for a stump and rest against it. "Daddy", the boy asks,

"I've never seen a stump like this ...could it be part of a dangerous animal?" His father replies, "No, son, animals don't look like this," and the elephant moves his leg crushing both of them. The ignorant father had mistaken the nature of the elephant for what he believed it to be - and it cost him his life and that of his son.

(cont. page 3)

So, there we (the Committee) were, resting against something and, with our eyes half opened, supposedly trying to decide what we should believe about it. In reality, though, most of us were sure from the beginning what to believe - like the back bayou cagin' daddy who could not even take the simplest pre-caution to risk doubt by taking a few steps back and taking a careful look at the "stump" before assuring his son's safety.

It is impossible to fully understand this overwhelming tide of "belief" unless you have been inundated by it - and most of us have, on one shore or another. This was the same tidal front that carried Proposition 13 in California, threatened Charity Hospitals in Mississippi may have gotten Gov. Hickel elected over Gov. Hammond in Alaska (they are still counting votes) and, when the undertow receded, we found a crowd cheering Richard Nixon in Kentucky. This was a wave of emotion, of intense feeling, with its epicenter at the heart of a frustrated people who have watched pride exchanged for welfare, moral character for slothfulness, fair-mindedness for greed, and sweat-of-the-brow for bureaucratic waste.

It is very unfortunate that such a serious issue such as homosexuality and the church surfaced at precisely the wrong time causing it to be picked up in a jumbled surf of pulled-up property taxes and splintered food stamps.

However, I do not think all the blame ought to be placed on these frustrated Poseidons. With some exception, I found the "liberal" position to be poorly defended and thought out. Many supported the possible ordination of a practicing homosexual, on the basis that some fleeting bird (the called the "Spirit") had decided to abandon its traditional coup of Scriptural and Confessional tradition and start a new colony. In other words, much of the "liberal" rhetoric was quickly devised and never nailed down in

the traditional way making it especially vulnerable for the deluge. There was also a "liberal" argument bouncing around that we ought to ordain homosexuals because we ordain adulterers and, afterall, God is a God of grace and forgiveness and all that neat stuff: That was hanging the defender before the trial.

My experience on this committee at G.A. was dis-ilusioning. A degree of spiritual participation for thousands of people rested on the work of our committee and assembly. We were responsible for doing our best in the time we had to study the problem as an objective jury might a capital case. Instead, we were a kangaroo court where the verdict was always known; it just took time to tie the knot and make the noose.

It is our human way that no matter waht our method may be, when we in our moment of frenzied search and demand for expeditious "definitive guidance: do grasp that javelin of alleged Truth, it invariably finds its way into the hearts and souls of ones whom are hardly a threat to righteousness, justice, order, creation, God's plan, God's will, or the New Jerusalem. It is these folk, deprived of their full spiritual involvement and labeled as deformities, that apparently must suffer our impatient look into a dim mirror that showed us what we wanted to see!

** Yorgos is this issue's "on the field" correspondent. He is a dedicated intern in Natchez, Miss. But does that beat last issue's missive by C.T. Iosso from Oakland, California?**

* * * * *

THE MINISTER'S THEOLOGICAL RESPONSIBILITY- Part II

by Dr. Seward Hiltner

As coordinator of a particular community, the minister is to ensure that general theological responsibility, as previously set forth, is exercised in that community. Not all the community's responsibility is to be carried out by the minister himself or herself. That is why the notion of the minister as theologian in residence may be misleading; for if you may have a theologian around, you may also not have one. Further, if the minister is acting as theologian only when unengaged in program duties, then the reflective and detached aspect of theology is over-emphasized at the expense of involvement in necessary activities and ministries. Nothing should cloud the fact that it is finally the community that bears theological responsibility.

Bearing general responsibility is not, however, the same thing as possessing the special knowledge and competence that presumably go along with the minister's education and vocation. It is legitimate, therefore, for the community to look to the minister for theological leadership. Certainly that should imply the minister's schooling the community at appropriate levels, on how to exercise its theological responsibility. But the minister would be copping out if he or she confined theological reflection to the level that could easily be taught to the people. Being one lesson ahead in the textbook is hardly enough.

The minister has three kinds of guidelines that may be used to help shape his or her theological responsibility over the course of a career. The first of these is some reasonable attention to theological responsibility in general as that has been described: attentiveness to the faith and heritage, wrestling with proper translation of it, and constant inquiry into its meaning and implications. There is

an inescapable obligation to keep up a little bit across the whole range of theological studies. To this end there are journals, continuing education programs, sound older books that one owns but never mastered, as well as the chance to select discriminatingly from new literature.

The second guideline, I am firmly convinced, is for the minister to give particular attention to that area of theology or of ministry that has most helped him or her to "come alive" as a minister. These areas may be very different for different people. They may be as varied as the letters of Paul, the dynamics of groups, clinical pastoral education, the patterns of worship, involvement in the inner city, of the life of Martin Luther. The point is that, for some people, the excitement engendered by some one of these areas has been indigenous, and has sharpened one's sensitivity to everything else going on in ministry. It is not the same thing as an academic field of specialization. One may never become an expert in it, technically speaking. But if the interest in it is inherent and strong, it is probably worth while to continue cultivating it so long as it continues to shed light on much beyond itself. Some interests of this enlivening kind appear to be lifelong, while others are useful for a time and then are supplanted by others that perform the same illuminating function.

The third guideline lies in disciplined theological reflection on the daily experiences of actual ministry, as discussed earlier in the introduction in connection with the Doctor of Ministry program. One might put it this way. Every act of ministry if it has been worth doing at all, and regardless of its apparent success or failure, deserves a little bit of reflection to the end of improvement next time. But if such reflection is non-theological, then the minister is as slowly but surely building a wall between ministry and theology as if he or she frankly renounced all theological interest.

I have already suggested, however,

that the impediments to making this kind of procedure habitual are formidable. It is not simply that a competent theological analysis of a ministry situation may show up deficiencies in what one has done or tried to do. The resistance seems deeper than such specific critiques. It seems determined to protect, at almost any cost, the notion that theology is a help and not a judgment. Earlier, I called this a "magic helper" conception of theology. From a psychological point of view, it demonstrates the process of defensive idealization, according to which it may be much more difficult to admit the possible error in one's view of the ideal self than to confess the flaws in the actual self. The early researches of Carl Rogers were instructive on this point. Successful counseling changed the view of the actual self. But it seldom touched the picture of the ideal self. The impregnable bastion was the imaginative view of what one might be. It is of course precisely this imaginative projection that a well-rounded theology calls into question.

When the ministers in our D. Min. program do learn to use a wide range of theological resources in analyzing their ministry situations, I believe they are learning to give up, however slowly and reluctantly, some kind of idealized view of theology. They see that theology is not a magic helper automatically supporting their intention in particular acts of ministry. They experience a critique of that very intention; but at the same time they receive a judgment on the past situation, they acquire an insight into the next situation. Theology is dethroned from its idealized state, and proves, all things considered, to be more helpful than otherwise. To arrive at that end, however, the notion that theology is to be attended to only when it is obviously helpful has had to be renounced. Hearing the word, as Karl Barth correctly stated, is at first always upsetting. Learning to listen for the word is, as he

was more reluctant to state, a source of deeper satisfaction than anyone knows who has never genuinely heard the word.

What can and should a seminary do to help its students and graduates to develop appropriate theological responsibility? Some of these things have been alluded to in the previous discussion, and need only to be mentioned. First, courses that deal with some dimension of ministry, such as preaching or pastoral care, can make explicit efforts to aid students to relate theological resources responsibly to the specific tasks. Second, it is my conviction that such learning is always greater when the actual experience of the student or minister is the focus of discussion. Third, there seems no good reason why a student's work in any branch of theology cannot, to some extent, be explicitly related to actual or potential ministry situations, or at least the background laid for the student to do so.

If these and other specific measures are to be effective, however, it seems necessary for students and ministers to be convinced that the faculty collectively is concerned to relate theology and ministry. The relatively good record that we have had in the D. Min workshops to this end suggest that, at least for the two workshop leaders, one from a classical and the other from a practical discipline, that really works. Virtually without exception, faculty members who have led such workshops have in fact been committed to relating theology and ministry, regarding neither as foreign to their task. That fact has had a paramount influence on the ministers in the workshops. Ordinarily they do not emerge from the program as research experts in any branch of theology or ministry. But they acquire wisdom in exploring those theological resources that can best guide them in a variety of

ministry situations.

I do not believe that we can precisely duplicate the D. Min. experience with students in the initial phase of theological education. The ministers are on the job fulltime, have accepted their ministerial role, and have encountered troubling problems on which they are seeking light. That may or may not be true of M. Div. and A.M. Students, but it is nothing against them that it is often untrue. Therefore, it is clear that a precise duplication of the D. Min. program would be unrealistic.

From the beginning of the D. Min. program, however, we have sought to explore what aspects of that agenda might have transfer value to our primary degree work. Already many courses are profiting in some respects from the inquiries. If the faculty were large enough to enable us to have more jointly taught courses crossing the lines of fields and departments, we could do still more.

There is, nevertheless, a factor of resistance in the faculty. This has arisen as the unintended consequence of improving theological knowledge and understanding by cultivating specialization in scholarship. Such specialization, whether in the New Testament, ethics, or Christian education, makes possible for faculty members a depth of exploration not otherwise possible. Unhappily, its unintended and undesirable corollary is often to give not only to individual faculty members but also to a faculty collectively the notion that they have been granted certificates of exemption from any responsibility except in relation to their field of specialization. It is a good thing to have freedom to explore an area in depth. But if much of the faculty's task is preparing people for ministry, it is not good if the certificates of exemption are displayed as prominently as the areas of special competence. The minister, present or future, knows that he or she will have to try to put it all together.

People who appear to have a license freeing them from any such responsibility can hardly be called the best role models.

It is to just this kind of situation that one of our experiments of the past two years has spoken very loudly and clearly. Since the autumn of 1976, three groups of faculty members, averaging ten or so at a time, have engaged in serious seminar study patterned on the D. Min. workshop model. Actual ministry situations in which faculty members have been engaged have been put into written form, and analyzed, with discussion focusing on the use of theological issues or resources to improve understanding of the situations of ministry. Every participating faculty member has exposed himself or herself in terms of an act of ministry, not just the field of specialization. Colleagues have dealt critically, but also supportively, with each situation. I have encountered no faculty member participating in one of these seminars who does not feel significantly improved by the experience. Not quite half the faculty have so far been involved in these seminars. It is my hope that the remainder of the faculty will either enroll for the seminar scheduled for 1979, or request one for a future date. The seminars are not a panacea. But in my seventeen years on this campus, they have done more to eliminate the certificates of exemption than anything else I have seen.

When each of these faculty seminars has concluded, its members have been impressed with the unfinished business of how the new insights may, at least in a few particular ways be carried over into regular work beyond the D. Min. program itself. There have been continuing meetings and discussion to that end. Every possible experimental advance has of course to confront the weight of heavily scheduled routine.

In however small a way, the

faculty seminars have made one declaration in principle that is of paramount importance. The participating members have said in effect: we will not ask ministers to do something that we have not made an effort to do ourselves. Token as it may have been, that involvement on the part of faculty members has included not only exposure of themselves in ministry situations but also exploration of theological resources relevant to those situations, no matter if the resources lie within the field of specialization or not. All certificates of exemption have been cancelled.

Is it possible for a theological seminary to induce its whole faculty to cancel their exemption certificates so that the issues and resources in theology itself, and in its relation to ministry, may be seriously and periodically discussed as a part of the ongoing life of the faculty as basic as developing curriculums or making policy decisions? I do not know the answer to this question. But I believe the recent seminars by the three faculty groups provide a potential climate for such discussion that was only nascent before.

Theology, whether we like it or not, is a complex business. Without faith and commitment, it would never get started. But without both scholarship and self-questioning, it would be without the cutting edge of inquiry. It is both initiated and concluded by involvement, but in between it must become at home with detachment, although never so comfortable as to aschew involvement altogether.

It is my testimony, perhaps not scientifically verifiable but nonetheless full of conviction, that God's grace has been operative in this seminary precisely in some of the activities I have described in this discussion. I am far from certain, in detailed terms of program, how we may respond to that action in the ways that will advance theological responsibility most effectively for ministers, for other students, and for ourselves. Something, however small and token it may be, has

happened here that is not of own conscious devising. If we recognize that, it is possible that we may not fail to hear the call.

** Viewpoint wishes to apologize for any misunderstanding connected with the publishing of Dr. Hiltner's sharp and pertinent address to PTS. No portion of his address in either this issue or the last may be reproduced in any manner. Dr. Hiltner is the author of over twelve books, including Ferment in the Ministry.**

* * * * *

POEM

Midnight winds that move the night
blow silent stars like luminous dust
in swirls about the fixed pole.
Moonlight pales terrestrial torments,
Backlit clouds glow with unearthly
translucence; they hover ethereal,
an untrammelled expanse of changing
forms, inciting metaphysical longing.
Standing on the desert floor,
reaching for that fantastic canopy,
like Tantalus gasping in the pool,
I am drowned in the rising torrent
of my own finitude. Standing on this
shore with a vision of the temporary
distance, all I feel is the distance.
Temporary chokes me like forever.
And longing, a word which character-
izes

my brief years, sweeps over in wave
upon wave of formless yearning.

Eternity...sweet timeless Godspace,
come break me on the intangible anvil
of your existence! Batter my head,
pierce my eyes with the sight of the
unseen, bludgeon me into that
holy beyond lest mere vanity traps
me within these crushing, myopic
phantasms that daily form like
heartless walls about me. And let
the epithet "mystic" mark my grave.

by W. D. Moen

* * * * *

UNTITLED

While my first impulse is to sign my name to this - because I'm certainly not ashamed of myself before the world in general or PTS in particular, but only before the Lord my God, and he has given me salvation - I don't believe that Viewpoint is the appropriate place for "personal confessions." And I do not wish to have it seem that this is ultimately a personal statement. It's a political one, and one in which I include autobiographical data primarily for the purpose of establishing my "qualifications" (as it were) for addressign the issue of the ordination of gay men and women to the ministry.

I understand that last year this was a Big Issue in Viewpoint, and apologize if I repeat what has already been written. In the first place, much of what I have to say is worth repeating. In the second, fellow-newcomers to PTS might be interested in hearing my views.

Yeah, I like women. Most men do. But I like men as well. That makes me something some people call "bi-sexual" (as which, perhaps, there's no such a thing, but we'll get into that in just a moment). OK. Who cares? The problem arises when I say that Jesus Christ is my Lord and Master and my Salvation. Further, I am a divinity student. There are those who would say I've got a problem on my hands. And I can't really disagree with them, although while they might maintain that my problem is between me and the Lord, I maintain that my problem is between myself and them. It is to such people (and I daresay there are many right here in PTS as well as the world in general) that I wish to address the following words.

Being "bi-sexual" means, at least theoretically, being 100% heterosexual 50% of the time and 100% homosexual 50% of the time. (In reality it hardly ever works out quite so evenly). And so, it falls into my hands to defend homosexuality.

(Heterosexuality, it seems, needs no defence).

Presently, the issue of homosexuality is in the spotlight in the UPC in terms of the ordination of gay men and women as ministers. It is claimed that the fact that one is homosexual renders one's lifestyle incongruent with the gospel. And here we do have a problem, for homosexuality is expressly condemned in both the Old and the New Testaments. Oh well. That is a difficulty, but not impossible to solve, as we shall find out by and by.

Can the heterosexual pastor of a church say that his or her lifestyle is automatically "more congruent" with the gospel than that of a gay man or woman who has been called to offer his or her life to the service of the Lord? Or are we all sinners saved by Grace? But scripture does give its blessing to "the heterosexual" and does condemn "the homosexual."

It is important here that I say a word about what "homosexuality" ultimately is. Besides having to do with sex, it has to do with love. It has to do with the heart. When I fall in love with a woman, whether or not any sexual "contact" is established, it is heterosexual love. When I fall in love with a man, whether or not any sexual "contact" is established, it is homosexual love. I feel the same emotions, the same concern for him as I do for her, the same desire to share my life with him as with her, the same delight in his company as in hers. How does homosexual love differ from heterosexual love? Only in the gender of one of the "participants". Otherwise, and I speak from experience, it's identical.

I maintain that what we're considering here is, essentially, a question of love. The Bible has various things to say about love. I don't believe it has much to say against it. In fact, love is a beautiful thing, and even an ennobling thing, something that draws us upward and out of ourselves, exalts us. In the final analysis, gender is of

minor importance.

For all its decisiveness on the issue of homosexuality, scripture is finally ambiguous in its attitude toward homosexual love, because while it condemns sexual immorality (hetero-as well as homosexual), it does speak highly of love. (I know what you're thinking. Here goes:)

So the question is this: is homosexual love "perverted" love? It is not. Certainly homosexual love can be, and often is, perverted. I've been to 42nd St. and Polk St. I've seen the ugliness and the sinfulness of the "gay world." But it is infinitely to the point to say that the same ugliness and sinfulness exists in the "straight world." There is as much that is pathetic and horrifying in the straight-world-at-its-worst. But there is also beauty in a man and woman in love. And there is beauty in two men in love, in two women in love. Certainly it hurts God (sic.) to see the perversion of homosexual love. It hurts him to see the perversion of heterosexual love, too.

As far as I know (correct me if I'm wrong), Jesus says nothing specifically aimed against homosexual love.

My present view of my own sexuality is this: I don't know what Jesus' position on homosexuality was/is. I don't even know for sure what the Biblical position is. I'm not sure what the moral position (apart from the Christian position) on homosexual love is. Or the psychological position. I'm uncertain about it all. But I know this: I do fall in love with men sometimes. That I'm not uncertain of. That's real to me. And I believe that whether or not I'm thoroughly mistaken, Jesus does love me, and he did die for me, and through his intercession I am saved.

I deny that I am "unfit" to preach God's message of salvation for all humankind through Christ because of the fact that I "like men." Nor do I consider myself unfit to engage in pastoral counseling,

church administration or visiting the sick and the elderly for that reason. Yes I am a sinner. The world at large will agree with you. Perhaps I'm more conscious of my fallen state because of the world's attitude toward "the homosexual" than I would be were I exclusively heterosexual, for the world blesses (and exalts) heterosexuality. But who among us is not a sinner, and yet we believe that we can be the Lord's instruments in this world, in his ministry.

For almost 2,000 years the Church did without the benefit of women as ordained ministers. Perhaps, it will always do without those "guilty" of homosexual love.

* * * * *

A LETTER TO JIM WALLIS

by John Hogman

Dear Jim:

It is not all that often that the social dimensions of the gospel are dealt with on this campus in quite the scope you did last week in the Student Lectureship on Mission. We should all be grateful for the rather systematic presentation of your approach to the call to 'faithfulness' in relation to the social order. It is a perspective carrying a great deal of power within concerned 'evangelical' circles on this campus and indeed around the country. We should not let this opportunity to probe some of the implications of your position and to explore alternatives pass by un-utilized, for what is at stake is the very nature of the Christian life in our time and place.

Your position can be characterized (I hope not unjustly) as a classic Anabaptist, Christ against Culture position grounded in particular understanding of the authoritative function of

scripture and the person of Jesus Christ in relation to the Christian life. Scripture (as it functioned authoritatively for you in your discussion) could be described as the witness to the Lordship of Jesus and the record of this Lord's ethical injunctions to his people. It was of interest to me that you mentioned Matthew as the book to which you most naturally gravitated since the first gospel is characterized by a high Christology buttressing the ethical injunctions issued by Jesus.

It goes without saying that this position is by no means universally pervasive within the church, nor even within the New Testament documents themselves. In discussing Matthew 28:16-20 ('The Risen Lord and the Earthly Jesus') Gunther Bornkamm points to this, "It hardly needs to be said that Matthew could never have spoken of Christ as the end of the Law or of the justification of the ungodly, just as Paul could never have spoken of the necessity of the Law, valid to the last jot and tittle, for salvation." The Pauline understanding of the Christian life is not worked out from the Lordship of Jesus and his enduring ethical injunctions to the church but rather upon the response of the faithful to the free grace of God in the Christ. (James Gustafson discusses at some length the different views of Jesus Christ and the Moral Life in his book of the same title). It is this tradition that has been followed by the Protestant Church in general and the Reformed Tradition in particular.

It is our contention that these two methods of conceiving of the Christian life and of doing Christian ethics (there are obviously many other alternatives within the Christian tradition) can lead to significantly different paths. Paths as different as those followed in the past by the Anabaptists and the Puritans. The one tradition following a classic Christ against Culture

position and the other following a position in which Christ is the transformer of culture (there is a great deal of overlap with what Niebuhr calls the Christ and Culture in Paradox position in which he places both Paul and Luther).

The particular position that you have expounded on the relation of Jesus to the moral life, and the way in which scripture functions authoritatively for it contributes to a serious flaw in your position from my perspective. It leads to a too rigidly codified understanding of the Christian life and does not allow you to address creatively the moral dilemma of America as a nation, nor does it allow you to speak a relevant word to those who seek to be 'faithful' (responsible) living in the mainstream of American society.

Let us deal with the second of these first. The moral injunctions around which you have developed your understanding of the Christian life are direct, simple to comprehend and relate to a situation in which relationships are personal and life is lived within a small community of significant others. The problem is that in our present society and culture this form of life is only a viable option for a few. For the majority the economic necessities of life in this society requires a greater degree of autonomous living. Also whether we like it or not our relationships with others in this society are primarily impersonal. We interact in the realm of commerce, politics and the arts through institutions and broader collectives. The degree of social justice that this society has achieved has been based on the balancing of power between these opposing interest groupings and not on an appeal to Christian renunciation. The sort of option that you propose appears to be at best a reformulation of the Anabaptist notion of the prophetic witnessing community set against

the society and perhaps at worst a self righteous abandonment of the power of your class and its responsible exercise because of the inevitable moral ambiguity that this entails.

This leads into the second problem that emerges with your position. Not only does it miss the real nature of the moral dilemma of the responsible life in our society but it hopelessly simplifies the necessary role of America in world politics. America is the most powerful nation on earth. It is not at preeminent as it was at the close of W.W. II but this fact remains. It continues to play a vital role (though within increasingly complex systems of relationships) in the maintenance of world order, a role dependent upon her continued military and economic strength. This does not mean that she has not tried to pour the holy water of 'maintain world order' on the pursuit of her own ends and goals. It does mean that just because a nation follows primarily its own interest (all do and any who didn't wouldn't last long) it does not necessarily follow that the wider interest of justice, equality and freedom are not served (perhaps even God's purposes). The dilemma of the American nation in this time is not how it can be the morally pure beacon to the rest of the world but how she can exercise her considerable power responsibly. Looking for the convergence of the national interest and the wider human good (the best example of this in modern times is the rebuilding of Europe after the war under the Marshall Plan).

Your position offers America only the option of Utopian model or relegation to the realm of 'this world' beyond the pale of redemption. It does not sufficiently recognize the positive possibilities for greater degrees of justice in the world in its attempt to

point to the moral ambiguity of all those possibilities and of the sort of actions one is involved in to achieve them.

It is obviously our opinion that there are resources within the Christian tradition that offer a more fruitful approach to the Christian life and the social order than the one you espouse. Perspectives that are more able to come to grips with the complexity of the Christian life within our present social, political and cultural context. These resources are more properly protestant and reformed having their roots in a reformation understanding of Humanity's relation to God and being most ably represented in this country by the political theology of Reinhold Niebuhr.

It is hoped that these few preliminary remarks can be the beginning of a dialogue on this campus arising from your lectures as to the nature of the Christian response in (or in your case to) the social and political order in which we inevitably function. Whether we agree or disagree with the substance of your position we should all be thankful for your straightforward presentation of your position and for the faithful life you are seeking to live out of that perspective.

John Hogman

** Our interpreter of seminary history turns his pen to dialogue with campus visitors. The editor adds only that Mr. Wallis' attention to missions (the purpose of the lectureship) could have been more intense.**

* * * * *

What's wrong with this statement?:

If men were all 4 feet tall and women were 6 feet, we wouldn't have any problem with rape.

* * * * *

FORUM ON THE GOSPEL: A DYNAMIC
FAITH

by Gregory Hall

The first issue of Viewpoint raised the issue of church growth. The Forum on the Gospel pointed to a report approved by the 188th General Assembly which found that the "mainline" churches in America are in a period of decline. Examples of their findings include the facts that the UPUSA has suffered a net loss of 17% since 1965 and that enrollment in UPUSA church schools has been cut almost in half since 1959. How are we to react to these disturbing facts? One of the most common reactions to the problem is to call for more missions and evangelism. This article seeks to explore these concepts and find out whether they are the answers that the church must look to.

The Christian Church is faced with the old business adage "Seek to grow or die." Samuel Moffet, in a recent article in The Princeton Seminary Bulletin, wrote the following story of one branch of the church in Persia:

"Less than ten years later the capital of the Persian empire and the center of the Nestorian church fell to the Muslims. The consequences to the church are sometimes exaggerated. It was the Zoroastrians, not the Christians, who were wiped out. Zoroastrianism was the Persian national religion and therefore anathema to the conquerors, but Christianity was a minority religion and was given lenient treatment as a possible ally against rebellious Persian nationalism. Evangelism, however, was forbidden. There were to be no more conversions outside the Christian community.

Faced with the choice of evangelism or survival, the Nestorians chose survival. But what survived was no longer a living church; it was a Christian ghetto. They had

given up their outreach--the evangelistic, missionary lifeline which is the only part of the Christian revolution that insures survival. So they withered away."

The story tells us that the church has to reach out to the world or die. Evangelism and missions in this context are not programs, committees or special techniques. Neither is evangelism and mission merely capitalism projected on religion. A social activist this summer told a friend of mine that if we really did have the Holy Spirit, we would not be interested in getting church growth. Just the opposite is true. The work of the Holy Spirit must be seen in terms of community growth, both qualitatively and quantitative or be relegated to narcissic individual pietism. Evangelism and mission are involved in a dynamic process. They are the church moving out from itself into the world presenting it with a message.

We are left with the question is this thrust generally missing from the life of the church today? John Mackay, President Emeritus, said in an interview last week that to be truly ecumenical, one has to be dynamic and missionary in character. He sees the whole church taking its message to the world. This emphasis seems to have been lost. Ecumenics is perceived more as static than dynamic. The ecumenical movement has become more of an attempt to unite existing religious social clubs rather than all Christ's church joining hands in reaching out to the world.

We must ask ourselves, why have we lost the evangelical, missionary thrust. Thus leaving the "mainline" churches like great lakes with no incoming fresh water gradually turning stagnant. I would like to suggest two possible reasons. One of the reasons is our selfishness. Even though we have been given the Gospel, we are sinful creatures

and our racism and classism makes us unwilling to share Christ with the poor, unwhite and uneducated. The General Assembly Report said that rapidly declining congregations are most often found in communities where the economic level is dropping and the proportion of minority persons is increasing. Our self-centeredness is perennial and must always be battled against. The second problem is more serious. Do we in the mainline church have a gospel? Do we feel that we have anything to share with our fellow human beings? Our loss of dynamics seems to have corresponded to the breakdown in theology. Conservative churches have retained missionary and evangelical zeal because they still, however much you or I might disagree, have a theology that they believe in.

The challenge that we as a seminary are confronted with is to help discover and create a new theology of the church's mission a theology which is our understanding of what the Gospel of Jesus Christ is and to learn how to present it to the world. If we are not successful in our task, then we might as well drain the stagnant lake and build a parking lot.

** Gregory Hall lives in Windgap, Pa., commuting daily to our fine institution in Princeton, N.J. Is this practice for future missionary travel? The next issue of Viewpoint will attempt to carry on some dialogue on the role of PTS in training for missions and evangelism.**

* * * * *

Work as if you were to live 100 years; pray as if you were to die tomorrow.

Ben Franklin

* * * * *

A PREFACE TO SOUTH AFRICA

by Bob Davis

We have each come to know that certain things are true in our lives, though some things more true than others. And in this range of knowledge there are perhaps one or two ideas that we know to be true with our whole heart. We may work to support those ideas with reasons and arguments, but these are extra things really, added on to that fundamental truth which we feel and know as intimately and completely as we know ourselves. One such truth, it seems to me, is the common brotherhood and sisterhood of all people. I don't think this idea can be taught very well, its like trying to teach kindness or compassion. It comes from the spirit - we are each responsible to all for all. There are no islands here, no separations or distinctions, except as we impose them, for as one writer described it, "It is all like an ocean, flowing and blending into itself, a touch in one place sets up movement at the other end of the earth."

The interconnectedness and interdependence of the world is recognized by biologists and economists as well as Christians. Our decisions and lifestyles do not transpire in a void but we are constantly touching and being touched by other people. When we can see this touch, which too often comes as a bruise or a wound, we feel the longing to help and to heal that other. But when we cannot see the touch, though it may be an even greater wound, our hearts and our hands remain quiet. I believe the wounds in South Africa are just this kind of unseen touch.

An interesting attitude has developed in our minds these last few centuries, we have come to feel that morality and compassion are suited for our relationships with individuals but among communities and even countries the idea is

different. For there it's the world of the marketplace, the language is that of profit, the morality is that of power. We have succeeded in creating a thoroughly private Christianity, one that condemns injustice and immorality among individuals but ignores it in relation to peoples and to cultures. The academic word for this is "institutional violence", the common word is "sin."

If we are sensitive at all and are willing to believe in the idea of a common brother/sisterhood, our minds are immediately baraged by a plethora of problems: Soviet Russia, Chile, Guatemala, Oakland, Trenton, Uganda, the list can almost go on endlessly. What we are then faced with is the difficulty of choosing a particular area especially deserving of our attention. In other words, we are in the position of making a personal political judgment. Vague statements of solidarity, commitment, etc, to the oppressed peoples of the world...are pretty much useless; and stirring denouncements of economic injustice and neo-colonialism also don't really help very much. What is required is a specific response to a specific situation. I would like to argue that South Africa deserves to be singled out from the tangle of repressions and tyrannies in the world as a case of special importance for Christians.

First, South Africa claims to be a Christian country. Unlike the generalized "In God We Trust" attitude of the U.S., South Africa is an explicitly Christian nation which defends apartheid as an expression of biblical teaching and Christian theology. Periods of daily prayer and biblical meditation are built into the institutional schedule of the armed forces; the government contends that it is a Christian instrument of charity for the black majority; public policy is often explicitly formulated in the language of Christian theology

in which Pass laws, trade union bans, a dollar a day wage for work in the mines, are all justified by referring to a distorted and misunderstood gospel of Christ.

Secondly, as Robert McAfee Brown has noted, South Africa's racism is doctrinal. Blacks are denied human rights because they are black, no other reason. The racism is institutional, built into the very fabric of South African life. Their Economy, politics, culture and entertainment, are all fundamentally racist. Third, the U.S. has very strong financial ties to the South African government. The South African economy, and thus the system of apartheid that the economy maintains, is heavily based on foreign investment. Eighty per cent of South African private industrial production is under foreign control or influence. Behind Great Britain, the U.S. ranks second as the largest foreign investor in South Africa. There are approximately four hundred U.S. firms active in South Africa with direct investments totaling \$1.6 billion book value, and U.S. banks have over \$2 billion in outstanding loans. But these figures don't accurately reflect the special qualitative importance of U.S. investment which is in its domination of the most strategic areas of South African economy, namely, petroleum, motor vehicles, computers, mining, heavy engineering, rubber and electronics. The U.S. is in a position of tremendous economic leverage in South Africa, a position it has so far refused to realize preferring to shield investments and prevent radical change.

As Dr. Brown has written, suffering and injustice aren't academic issues, any more than religion is an academic issue. There is a point in our reflection where what we have studied about truth and community and peace must stir up in us a passion and a longing to

realize practically what we have understood intellectually. The process of reflection can justify itself only insofar as it can concentrate this passion and lead the individual to an informed expression of it. We are genuine in our reflection only when that reflection has lead us to a specific decision about how we live.

Money isn't neutral and the way we use and invest our money has lasting effects on people's lives. Investment in South Africa is investment in apartheid, and the same protest which is felt for institutional racism must also be raised against the system of corporate investments which support that racism. The argument that the U.S. presence in South Africa and the gradual economic growth of U.S. holdings can produce change is an historical lie. It cannot be proved either theoretically in reference to the particular economic organization of South Africa or historically in reference to any significant changes in labor practices since the advent of U.S. investments. Apartheid is not an outdated system which will eventually be replaced in response to economic growth for the simple fact that apartheid has been and remains the basis for that growth. U.S. investments offer no significant challenge to the system but rather reinforce it by supplying South Africa's desperate need for risk capital and by legitimizing the existing distribution of wealth and power.

There are many possible responses to this situation. The fact that you've read this much of a rather boring article is an important sign, because at this point what I am asking is that we begin to read the evidence, consider the arguments, and begin to think for ourselves about the relationship between the money the U.S. invests in South Africa and the conditions that exist there. Our presence in a Christian seminary carries an implicit

commitment to the value of study and reflection. This is precisely what is necessary at this stage in regard to South Africa: enter the debate, learn the facts, and make decisions.

Of course there are always other things to do. We can choose to stay hidden in ourselves, living out our isolated Christianity and our private dramas without ever taking seriously the idea of a common community of all men and women. In fact, this is a choice we've gotten rather good at. But I don't think its one we can live with much longer. Fyodor Dostoevsky in his novel The Brothers Karamozov writes:

"Above all in our age everyone strives to keep his individuality as apart as possible, wishes to secure the greatest possible fullness of life for himself; but meantime all his efforts result not in attaining fullness of life but self-destruction, for instead of self-realization he ends by arriving at complete isolation. All mankind in our age have split up into units, they all keep apart, each in his own groove; each one holds aloof, hides himself and hides what he has, from the rest, and he ends by being repelled by others and repelling them... But this terrible individualism must inevitably have an end, and all will suddenly understand how unnaturally they are separated from one another. But until then we must keep the banner flying. Sometimes even if he has to do it alone, and his conduct seems to be crazy, a man must set an example and so draw men's souls out of their solitude, and spur them to some act of brotherly love even if he seems crazy, so that the great idea may not die."

** Bob Davis is a junior from Stanford University, evidently with some idea of love with a social dimension.**

* * * * *

SEMINARY CONCERNS

AN OPEN LETTER TO JUNIORS

By John Wilbur

I am about to enter my third and final year at Princeton Seminary. During these three years I have noticed the already small group of social activists significantly diminishing.

Some activists have graduated - "The administration doesn't listen to activists, they graduate them." - taken leaves of absence; enrolled in internships; or dropped out to pursue other careers. Among the faculty, Dick Shaull, a cornerstone for activism, will be on sabbatical this year after which he will probably leave the seminary permanently.

Student activists go through a familiar pattern of behavior at PTS. Incoming activists are extremely optimistic about effecting change, such as, placing a student on the board of trustees. They become frustrated by the overwhelming lack of response at all levels. An overload of work develops in introductory courses and they buckle under the increasing threat of failing, sacrificing their activism to grades. The next year a foreboding silence is held until graduation.

Not challenging the "way things have always been done: is one characteristic of the minister role model I have been implicitly taught to follow here at Princeton. The possibility that this behavior is continued in the pulpit is considerably alarming.

There is something about the Princeton system that discourages the social gospel model for ministry.

To begin with, Princeton's conservative reputation attracts a predominantly conservative candidates pool. Therefore admissions necessarily perpetuate a conservative, white male campus with a token proportion of blacks (5%) and international students (7%) and a minority of white women (25%).

The foundation of the seminary, that it, the board of trustees has not encouraged social activism while I've been here. Of the 40 member board, three fourths are over 56 years of age; six are women and two black. Not that age is a condemnatory quality, but it can indicate the type of ministerial model preferred. The drive made by a few students to place a student on the board was met by an overriding no from that body.

President James McCord himself sets a pervasive role model for the seminary community. He has not participated on campus in any of the seminary's current social issue concerns, such as women's issues or South Africa.

The regulations the administration sets for the seminary appear to discourage activism. The handbook states, "Seminary facilities must not be used for political purposes or campaigning... Faculty and staff have an obligation to perform normal responsibilities, and participation in partisan political programs should not be at the expense of these responsibilities."

Most teaching at Princeton tends to be from one perspective and therefore does not promote activism through dynamic debate. Of the 39 fulltime faculty members, 90 % are white males in spite of 1975 General Assembly guidelines designed to offset this imbalance.

A recent seminary self-evaluation report notes, "This indicates a likelihood of significant continuity in thought about ministerial education at Princeton Seminary." It continues, "If the basic

bi-polarity of American society is seen as that between white males and all others, there is really no distinction of background or expertise in the present unanimity of its gender and race." There is basically one role model provided from which students, including blacks and women, learn. That model is not only white and male but also non-activist.

Finally and most effective of all are the social factors that discourage activism. The central gathering place on campus is the student dining hall. It is small enough so that everyone is scrutinized daily by the student body in general. Activist students ironically confess their tribulation over obtaining lunch. Social ostracism occurs when labels are used to glibly sum up other students.

The majority of the seminary community seems to avoid activists because they are seen as angry trouble-makers. (After all, who wants to be yelled at during lunch?) On the other hand, for example, if a woman activist sits at an all male table, conversation inevitably focuses on the women's issue, the woman being grilled and debated. Activists too, consequently, tend to avoid this type of situation.

In particular response to women activists has arisen a small extreme-right group of white males that enforces their norm by various surreptitious activities which have included hanging in effigy an outspoken activist, spray painting the women's center sign, crude graffiti, intimidating behavior towards women with anonymous letters and phone calls.

These factors all play their part in making a difficult life for the activist. Many feel why should they try with of little support and response. As a result, activists are discouraging other activists from coming to Princeton Seminary.

We were advised that if our three years at Princeton were not some of our most difficult years then something had gone wrong. It is true that

attempting the Christian life is struggling to live. Yet all struggles are not the same. There is a value difference between the struggle of someone striving for an A in Greek and someone petitioning an administration to divest itself of its economic interests in South African-related corporations just as there is a difference between someone working his or her way up the corporation promotion ladder and someone organizing a union. Perhaps activists raise the question for all to consider: Where should our priorities be in living out the Christian struggle?

Certain work can in fact distract us from the struggle to which Jesus calls us. For students who reply that they are too busy with their studies to become involved, when will they have time to devote to social action? The work load will not get lighter after seminary. With demands from pastoral counseling, session meetings, service preparation, when will there be time to struggle with current social issues?

The seminary that is controlled either by its pietistic or social gospel factions is seriously handicapped in aiding its future ministers develop realistic and workable Christian perspectives. The social gospel extreme reduces the Kingdom to a matter of progress, while that of pietism ignores the call to labor toward it.

Pietists sensitize our spirituality while activists root us in historical context. We might weigh our pietistic tendencies with our social gospel responsibilities. A seminary that incorporates the vital functions of both elements best prepares its students.

We should strive at designing a seminary that tolerates not only the pietists but also those who are called to live out a social gospel. Two fundamental suggestions for change at the seminary to encourage renewed activist representation are:

1) actively seeking students from more liberal undergraduate colleges and;
 2) including students in the decision-making process of the seminary community and not merely on an ad hoc, advisory basis.

Decisions made this year, or the lack of, will determine the future composition of Princeton Seminary. On its present course it will soon become a haven for charismatics; with necessary policy changes it could become a community that insures the inclusion of social gospel along with its pietistic elements.

** John Wilbur is a senior who obviously would rather avoid carrying the social action flag alone. Those interested in change should note that the Social Action Committee meets every Thursday at 6:30 p.m. in the Alexander Lounge student government.

* * * * *

IS P.T.S. AN OLD WINESKIN?

by Chris Iosso

New students meet old students. Curious students meet knowing students. Anxious students meet angry students. Will new students fight old students' battles? Will old students share new students' trust? Does the seminary make people wiser, or merely more wary? And can the seminary expect to transform students, without expecting to be transformed? For us students in particular, what structures are there for transformation? Do we as new students--new wine--simple become old, or can we help renew our wineskin, the seminary?

Some would insist on the necessity of a new wineskin, forgetting that none of us are really new wine. Some of us know that old wine can be

good, and try to mix right in, ignoring our own flavor and potential strength. And some of us whine, growing cynical and inactive, neglecting the effect that wine should have on wineskins.

Here at PTS there are some possibilities of the wine improving the wineskin, as well as vice versa--granting that a patchwork job is about all we can hope for. Obviously, I speak for the Student Government--usually a weak organization--and usually a testimony to the ignorance and docility of its student body. And obviously at this odd cross between a professional and a graduate school the issues are a bit different from those at a university or in society. Most wish to prepare quietly for a church vocation--and most see their vocation lived out in a quiet church. This is why a quieting seminary is so dangerous. The danger is not that the wineskin might burst--but that it continues to shrink, like the church it ministers to and from the questions the world poses.

Speaking less metaphorically, the Student Government was disappointed that it was unable to meet with a committee from the Board of Trustees during their recent meeting. We look forward to a meeting later in October--and invite any with constructive suggestions to share them with us as we prepare for this time. The trustees did, of course, meet with students in the cafeteria on Monday the 9th--individual students meeting with individual trustees, outside any structures of representation or mutual accountability. Questions of the Seminary's investments and policy toward its portfolio remain, as do many of the concerns raised in the 10 year Review Committee's recommendations of last year. Partly on the basis of our very productive conversation with representatives of the various alumni classes on Monday the 2nd, we remain convinced that the issues to be discussed are not purely

symbolic.

As to what the issues are; this is a problem only for those without ears and eyes. The basic issue, though, is that of student responsibility and awareness, and the basic challenge that of being "cynical activists." If this sounds anything like Rene Dubos' "despairing optimist" column in the American Scholar, rest assured; Princeton Seminary can sometimes be an excellent introduction to practical politics.

** Our student body president is finally here in body as well as soul and judging from the intoxicating subject of his article, we also know where his mind may have been back in California.** - Note: Incidentally, the title of this article is in no way intended to reflect on the Wineskin, a worthy menu of campus entrees and side dishes.**

* * * * *

UPDATE

by Sharon Esposito

An addendum to comments by Chris Iosso regarding Student Government, includes a comment on a variety of issues we consider to be student victories "of sorts." Included in this are:

Campus Pastor:

Who is the pastor's pastor? This is not a rhetorical question. The need for finding an answer to this question cannot be understated, particularly in a community in which individuals, in the course of a theological education, pass through the fires of intellectual, psychological and spiritual testing. The intensity of life here very often leads students to feel the need for counseling of some sort. There are a number of provisions for these

needs, including those listed in the student handbook (p. 47-48). However, many students have found themselves in the position of either not knowing where to go for help, not having funds for various counseling services available or approaching professors who already have a full counseling load. Through raised consciousness of these needs, through the efforts of individual students (led by Ina Boyd) meeting with President McCord and through the efforts of the students who participated last year in the 10 year Accreditation Review by the Association of Theological Schools and the Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, the seminary is increasing efforts to fund the position of Pastor to this seminary community. The funds if procured, will come through the Major Mission Fund, from a budget item designated "Pastoral and Spiritual Nurture for Students." An overwhelming confirmation of the need here came in an October meeting of alumni representatives, in which this effort was announced, when many of the alumni themselves affirmed the need they felt for a campus pastor 10 and 15 years ago when they were students here. This is an issue that is too important to be ignored and calls for continued student interest and support.

M. Div. Program:

Through the year long efforts of the student-faculty Academic Review Committee, some of the recommendations of that Committee have been implemented this year:

- 1) Enhanced advisor program for Junior year involving continuing support by professors assigned to incoming students. All Juniors met with advisors during preregistration and then two weeks into the semester. There are additional meetings set up throughout the year. Listen gang...this is an opportunity that most of us did not have and you need to take the initiative in

bringing your own particular questions and concerns to these meetings.

2) In addition, responding to the need for greater integration of various themes of biblical authority, hermeneutics, etc., professors in Ol courses have tried this year to coordinate scheduling of lectures so that various disciplines will, from their particular perspectives deal with these themes simultaneously. The Committee is pursuing possible themes for greater coordination and the need to integrate these themes with the departments of Practical Theology and Church and Society.

3) The professors in major Ol courses have also compared syllabi so that major course requirements will not all be due on the same day.

4) The Academic Review Committee's Subcommittee on Minority and Women's Concerns has recommended, as priorities, the need for a Coordinator for Black Students, for Vocational Counseling for Women and For

additional courses specifically focusing on these areas. We also note the addition to the staff of two women professional administrators Ms. Brostrom O'Brien and Ms. Rudiselle.

5) Other issues are continuing to be addressed such as preceptorial structure and class size.

The student government will continue to keep you informed of student concerns. But...it requires your interest and support to be effective and we look forward to your own efforts to enhance our life together here.

** Sharon Esposito is an at-large representative to Student Government.**

Ed. Note - Viewpoint wishes to add that it sincerely appreciated the show of concern for students by the Trustee's sharing dinner with us last Monday night (rather than sipping tea as usual). We look forward to further (and more frequent?) dialogue of this kind in the future.

(Additional Note:

A study/action group is being formed on the seminary campus to consider some of the issue involved in South Africa. Watch for details.

viewpoint

Vol. 18, No. 3

November 3, 1978

"LITTLE SUNDAY" OR DAILY OFFICE ?

BY ROBERT C. DAVIS

For the past few weeks, I and a number of other members of the Seminary's Chapel Group have been receiving reactions to this year's daily chapel program. While we do hear comments concerning the program in general, most of the Seminary community's reaction has centered around the Friday chapels, the day of the reformed Payer and Psalm service. To say the least, reaction has been decidedly mixed: a few have praised the services as a welcome opportunity to concentrate on prayer and praise without the distraction of a homily; others have praised the idea behind the services, but believe the implementation to have been somewhat shoddy; still others have condemned the entire idea as simply novel at best, and manipulative at worst. One comes away with the definity conclusion that there is no middle ground in these reactions; one either likes the services or dislikes them, with the "dislikes" the larger number.

That the Friday chapels have caused a certain amount of comment is not surprising. Nor is the fact that the reaction is so mixed, given the diversity of traditions and attitudes present. Despite this, however, I do get the impression that behind many of these comments lies an attitude contrary to the very definition of daily worship: that each chapel service; that each chapel is somehow a "Little Sunday".

The problem with this attitude is that it runs directly counter to the intentions of both the original reformers and, I believe, to the intentions of the Seminary Chapel Program. The reformers never meant for daily prayer to be seen as "Little Sunday", but rather, modeled daily prayer after the "Daily Office" of the medieval monastic tradition. The change they made was to shift from the practice of "hours" of prayer each day (Matin, Lauds, Prime, Terce, Sext, None, Vespers and Compline), to a practice more convenient for the working public, that of morning and evening prayer. This shift was in line with their belief that all worship should involve the entire worshipping community, and not be viewed merely as a form of private devotion. What they did not do was to throw out the

CONTENTS - Part I

Chapel Worship; "Little Sunday" or Daily Office?

by Robert Davis

Prayer in Miller Chapel?

by Arlo D. Duba

An Open Letter to Open Mouths

by Bert Mayne

Introductory Christian Economics

by P.F. Rack

Part II

Sojourner Jim Wallis: An Appreciation

by W.P. Moen

Letter to John Hogman

by Cara Davis Smith

Forum on the Gospel: Continuing the Dialogue with W.D. Moen

by Mark Carlson

Part III

Student Government Background Paper

by Chris Iosso

Update

Viewpoint is an informal journal of frank and creative discussion, published by the students of Princeton Theological Seminary. Essays, poetry, stories, commentary, and graphic are all welcome--though the editor reserves the right not to publish certain contributions. The opinions expressed in Viewpoint are simply those of its contributors and do not necessarily reflect the official position of the Seminary or of the editorial staff. Issues are published every two weeks with articles submitted by Wednesday of the week before publication. It is best to photostat copies of any material submitted as it tends to get marked up in the process of editing. The Viewpoint Box is in the administration building.

Suggestions, contributions, or mere interest may be directed to the Viewpoint box or the more informal setting of 402 Alexander Hall (residence of the editor).

Editor & Senior Associates:

Mark Carlson, John Hogman, Mark Durrett

Other Associates:

Paul Rack, W.D. Moen, Gregory Hall, Nick Boolukos

as did much of the theology behind it.

This being the case, and the Seminary standing within the Reformed tradition, does it really make sense to insist that every chapel service exist as a Platonic extension of the Sunday Service? Certainly it is understandable that those who accept this definition as their own see the Friday chapel service as an intrusion rather than an addition to the chapel program as a whole. But the point to be made here is that the molders of the chapel program do not see it in terms of Sunday Service, but in terms of daily office, a view that makes the Friday service not an intrusion, but rather the norm of daily chapel worship. Thus, those who criticize the Friday service because it does not conform to traditional Sunday practice do an injustice both to the service itself and to the chapel program as a whole.

All of this is not to imply that reaction by the Seminary community is not welcome. To the contrary, reaction is sought out and is noted for careful consideration. In fact at this writing, both the Chapel Group and the Faculty-Student Chapel Committee are working to find ways to improve the Chapel program both in terms of theory and practice, and when success is achieved, it will be due in no small measure to the openness and honesty of the Seminary community as a whole. I would note, however, that the use of common criteria is more helpful than those which are kept in private. I would suggest two, both of which imply a strict theological discipline: First, is the chapel program, or any part thereof, spiritually valuable, and second, is it educationally valuable? If what is being done in chapel fulfills these two criteria, then it will have achieved a measure. If, however, one or both criteria are being violated, then we are given a clue as to how to improve present practice. Either way, the ultimate gain belongs to the entire worshipping community.

** Robert C. Davis is an M.Div. graduate of Princeton Seminary and is currently enrolled in the Th. M. program. He is a member of both the Faculty-Student committee on the Chapel and the Seminary Chapel Group, and was chairperson for the 1977 Paschal Vigil. **

PRAYER IN MILLER CHAPEL ?

by Arlo D. Duba

Two years ago a group of students was sitting in Alexander Hall, lamenting the number of "soapbox" talks they had endured in Miller Chapel that spring. Student after student seemed to have some idea or cause to lay on the community. They more or less agreed that they preferred a service of praise to the Lord, to hear some word from Scripture and to pray together in praise and intercession. They wanted fewer student talks.

Into the room came someone who said he had been asked to lead chapel the next week, but now wouldn't be able to. He looked at a friend and asked, "Could you take my place?"

"Fraid not. I don't have time to prepare a sermon."

To lead in worship means to preach. Or, does it? Or, is that all it means? Our reformed understanding has always put Scripture and prayer together, and has even called the service of worship, the church at prayer.

But in Miller Chapel we are frequently deprived of prayer. Already this year we have had several chapels during which the only prayer was a perfunctory "flag salute" prayer at the very opening. And a homily without a prayer leaves one with the impression of having heard (endured) just another lecture.

Perhaps things don't change much. In 1849 Samuel Miller (after whom the chapel was later named) said, "While we censureothers for undervaluing preaching, we must not excuse Presbyterians if they sometimes appear to undervalue public prayer" (Thoughts on Public Prayer, p. 15). He points out that no worship leader should "imagine that sacred attention to the preparation for (leading in prayer) can be safely neglected" (p. 139).

This has been a frequent item of discussion in the faculty Committee on the Chapel during the past two years. The committee has become more and more insistent that balance between Scripture (with its exposition) and prayer

should be carefully observed. This is written into the guidelines for chapel leaders which every Senior has received and which are shared with every chapel leader. Whoever leads a chapel service, will be expected to lead the congregation in prayer. If we are able to move to teams of two people as chapel leaders each day, (student-student or faculty-student), it is assumed that one person will read the Scripture and the other will lead in prayer.

In the old days they called this "leading us before the throne of grace." Commentary on Scripture, prayerfully prepared, may share in this quality. But as Miller said, both are important and neither should be neglected.

So, what we are looking for are students who will accept the challenge of leading this community in its praise and prayer, that the praise of this people and its common life may constantly lifted before the Lord.

** Viewpoint doubts that any introduction is needed for Dr. Duba. **

AN OPEN LETTER TO OPEN MOUTHS

by Bert Mayne

It makes nutritional sense to say that "we are what we eat", and it makes religious sense to say that we are also "how we eat". Americans eat more than their share of the world's food and use up more than their share of the world's natural resources and energy. We are overstuffed with protein. We are glutted on highly processed, highly energy-expensive foods. As a result of our profligate abuse of God's bounty we also have more than our share of heart disease and related disorders in this country.

Christ teaches us to care for others. Christ teaches us that we are only stewards of the abundance which God blesses us with. And Christ calls us to show our love for our brothers and sisters on this limited earth. The medical authorities may not know what is good for our souls but what they have to tell us about our bodies confirms that "the wages" of the sinful way in which most Americans eat "is death".

One of the greatest villains in our daily diet is, as doubtless we have all heard by now, the overconsumption of red meat. We tend to think, in this country, that unless we've had at least one form of meat with every meal we're not eating well. This is simply not the case. Billions of human beings have fared beautifully with little meat in their diet, or with none at all. If just half the soybeans we feed to cattle were fed to people instead, we could feed another 100,000,000 people each year. Cattle need around 16 lbs. of high quality feed to produce one pound of weight gain on their bodies. In a time in which nearly one third of the world teeters on the brink of starvation, can we be indifferent to the facts of nutritional life?

As one who grew up on a farm raising beef and eating plenty of it whenever I felt like it, I know what allure is possessed by a thick steak nearing perfection on a charcoal grill. I've wolfed down my share, and then some, of Big Macs, or their equivalent. But the time came when I just felt that it would be better for both me and the rest of the world if I began to modify the way I lived. Even more than that, the time came when I realized that as a professing witness to the Kingdom of God I was responsible for making my lifestyle tally with my stated beliefs.

It is not easy to change the eating habits of a lifetime. But if others in this crowded world are to have lifetimes which include any eating at all, we have to begin to be concerned. We have to begin to care enough to cut back on our daily waste of food. We have to begin to believe in Christ so much that to live in a manner which condemns children of other nations to agonizing deaths as victims of our unconsidered appetites is some-

thing we will never again take a hand in.

Start small, take your time. But start! Begin to ask about how much protein your body needs. Begin to find out how much protein there is in four ounces of meat, in an egg, in fish, in legumes and grains, in milk products. Don't misread this as an appeal to a return to some ascetic, self-flagellating type of joyless existence. Not at all! Think of all the sources of vegetable protein (there are more than you ever thought possible!) and then think of all the ways to prepare them (the list is endless as the variety of cultures and cooks they come from!) and then think of a fatty lump of limp beef of dead cow (two choices here, veal or beef) lying in a pool of something the cook calls "gravy" (but which you suspect as the cause of the beast's demise) and I think you can begin to see that it might even be more fun to not chain our tastebuds to meat, meat and more meat.

The economics of vegetable protein consumption is the final selling point I wish to present. Did you ever wonder how people can manage to eat and stay alive in countries in which the per capita income is only a fraction of that of the U.S.? Simple. They do it by eating vegetable protein instead of meat protein. People who want to save a great deal of money on their food bills can do it very easily by a practice known as eating lower on the food chain. All this means is that you can eat the balanced complementary vegetable proteins, all of them, instead ~~vegetable proteins, all of them, instead~~ of taking the one-sixteenth that is left some cow has had first crack at the harvest and given you the second-hand, high-priced version of the protein. If you have any undue reservations about eating lower on the food chain, you might want to think of it as a parallel to reading all the real articles for yourself, rather than letting the Reader's Digest pick the parts you'll be exposed to. The joy is immense, the benefits legion, the creative possibilities myriad, and the profound sense of peace one enjoys when one is no longer a

mixture of "a hypocritical-stomach-in-the-midst-of-an-otherwise-perfectly-sound-Christian" is a genuine blessing.

For those of you who are fighting the budget battle here at PTS and want some more information on cutting back your food spending, please start looking for ways you can begin to leave the meat-trap. Call me if you can't get any other information. Or come to the Social Action Committee meeting (every Thurs. eve. 6:30-7:30P.M. Alexander Hall Lounge) and ask me there.

For those of you who think that one person can't do much by simply altering his/her eating habits, consider the fact that any whole is equal to the sum of its parts. You are a part of the world we seek to change in the Name of Christ. Your presence alone guarantees that you are having some effect on the whole world.

For those of you who rightly say the food plan which you must be a part of through the Campus Center Cafeteria determines what choices you can make, I can only say that I can appreciate this problem. As a married resident of the PW apts. I do have a meal planning choice not open to you. It is, however, the case that many other educational institutions in this country have provided alternative meal plans when they know that there was a significant demand for such a program.

I sincerely believe that how we eat is a real issue to us as Christians. It is a matter of all-too-familiar fact that it is a life-and death issue in many parts of the world today. I hope and pray that we can stand, as persons preparing for the Gospel ministry, for a lifestyle, a total lifestyle, a total lifestyle, which reflects both our

concern and our consistency as professing Christians. In closing, I

ent you to know that if I have left many questions unanswered in your mind, then I am glad. If I have made any difference in the way you feel the next time you think about what you eat, then I am glad. But best of all, if even a few people want to join with those of us who believe that Christ cares about our stewardship of food, then all I be glad.

We are what we eat. Only let us make "how we eat" a Christian witness also.

* Bert Mayne is a PW resident and junior from New York State.**

* * * * *

INTRODUCTORY CHRISTIAN ECONOMICS

by P.F. Rack

But if personalities could be replaced by abstractions of power, if techniques developed by the corporations could be brought to bear, might not nations live rationally? One of the dearest postwar hopes: that there should be no room for a terrible disease like charisma... that its rationalization should proceed while we had time and resources...

In Thomas Pynchon's Gravity's Rainbow (source of the quote) we are presented an elaborate mythology explaining how we got to where we are in the Twentieth Century - specifically, how we managed with good intentions to turn the world into a concentration camp. Pynchon bases his speculation on the theories of the great German sociologist, Max Weber. Weber insisted that as the industrial age continued, specialization increased, and social structures became bigger, more centralized, and more bureaucratic. A corollary to all this is that freedom diminishes as humans are less and less responsible for what they are. It is into this world, one which is experiencing the culminating stages of the apokalyptic spirit for freedom and charisma and spirit in a world choking in the vise grip of control, routine, and scientism.

It is through the category of freedom that the Christian has tried to work out the Gospel in the political realm. And in the course of this some of us became attached to every vaguely left-wing person and cause that managed to emerge in the last ten years. But many of us are coming to the conclusion now in 1978, that ideology, at least along the traditional left/right lines, is meaningless as far as the enhancement of human freedom is concerned. For instance, Capitalism, for all its terror and oppression, is hardly worse than what Marxism, in its Leninist forms, has evolved into. Both are simply massive bureaucracies. Both feed on individuals and communities while never feeling the least bit compelled to answer for what they do. Neither system has shown itself at all able or willing to apply itself constructively to the needs of people. Both may have been steps forward for freedom in their times, but Capitalism as well as Marxism have now been routinized into two all similar forms of institutional terrorism.

And we who trace our lineage through the Movements of the Sixties, who tried to fight the demonic excesses of our culture by reform on the government level, have been shown our errors. Big government is no better than big business, not to mention big labor. In fact, after a while we realize that big anything is necessarily going to have little to do with enhancing human freedom and dignity. We discover, under the guidance of E.F. Schumacher and others, that bigness itself is the oppressive quality in our society; that what we ought to be working on if we want to regain the responsibility for our own lives is the breaking down of these bureaucracies to a level where they can be creatively utilized on a local level.

If we are to survive to see any kind of Post-Industrial Age on this

planet, we must realize, as Max Weber did a century ago, that the seeds of our annihilation are found in bigness. When structures get so vast that we lose our sense of responsibility for the way our world is, for the way in which we live our lives on a local and personal level, then we also lose our freedom to determine what we will be. The definition of who we are is no longer heard as a call from God, but now comes down to be signed in triplicate from a secular office "upstairs". And paradoxically, we discover that when our responsibility for our own lives evaporates and we are lost in the vastness of the Modern World, then we are suddenly saddled with a very real guilt for the conduct of the whole structure in which we participate. This comment cries out for some unpacking....

In pre-industrial rural America, it is safe to generalize that communities had what they produced. This is an over-simplification to be sure, but the point is that people were not very far removed from the means of production. We could to a very great extent be responsible for what they had: food was grown on the premises or purchased from a farmer. The same with clothing and other necessities. It was possible to look the people who were directly responsible for producing good right in the eye and to know them personally. The producer had to put personal reputation on the product.

Today, this is virtually impossible in nearly all cases. What we have has been mass-produced in nearly all cases anonymous workers halfway around the world. Neither retailer nor wholesaler is directly responsible for what goes between them. No one's name or livelihood is in the line. Where we once bought tomatoes at a market from the farmers who grew them, today we buy Coke from a machine and unwittingly condemn with every purchase thousands of semi-slaves on Cola plantations in South America. Our tomatoes are shipped from God-knows-where and sold in sterile neon supermarkets, and our only contact with a person is that impatient high school kid at the cash register.

Thus we at once lose responsibility for our own lives by being at the mercy of a huge impersonal organization, and become directly answerable as a group for what that structure does to people at the other end. We lose personal and

community freedom, and gain mass guilt. And as far as I can see, the only way to regain this freedom is to bust up the bureaucratic structures of the

Modern World. This furthermore cannot be done from the top down, for that recognizes bigness. This we tried to do in the Sixties, and failed miserably because we were operating on the premise that big is better. On the contrary we must begin with "big is worthless". Then we can start creatively from the bottom up by forming independent and self-sufficient communities. We can't fight bigness on its terms, we can only play by totally different rules. As Christians we recognize that only rules worth following are those on which the Kingdom is based.

A last note: In the beginning of Pynchon's novel, a group of innocent Londoners are caught on a train during the Blitz, slowly rolling through the cavernous darkness beneath the city, waiting, waiting for the light to strike and set them free. But rather than being stricken by the sudden flash, the reader is told the news, "But it is already light!" It is this fact, that the Light of the world is here with us right now and not something we wait for as we endure the darkness: This is the Christian's message to the people of the Post-Industrial Age. We have to believe that God is in control, we have to believe that the Kingdom is a reality, we have to believe we are free to be what God wants us to be, that He cuts through the structures like a sunbeam through the smog.

** P.F. Rack is chairperson of the social action committee and cohort of "Cosmic Pete" Ferriby. His greatest claim to fame is living with the human whirlwind, Pete Taft, for a full year and still maintained the poise and integrity that we have come to know and love in Paul.**

DIALOGUE AND DISSENT

SOJOURNER JIM WALLIS: AN APPRECIATION

by W.D.Moen

Jim Wallis, is not much of a speaker. He is actually somewhat more of a mumblar than the incendiary, flamboyant bearer of prophetic "hard words" that one might expect of someone wearing a full beard and no tie. The predictable content of his lectureship was scarcely abetted by the tranquil, almost bland tone of his presentation. In short, he doesn't support his voice, has an indifferent diaphragm, and our speech department will be relieved to know that he is the product of some nondescript midwestern seminary. Earl Palmer he is not.

Yet Wallis has something to say, something which perhaps will not be heard unless listened for; something, furthermore, which is not merely presented as one of a variety of options for the church, but rather, much too our corporate chagrin, is something that is central to and inextricable from the Gospel message. That is what Wallis is suggesting and that is why his message must be dealt with, refuted or embraced. But not ignored.

Now one might not expect the lectures of a radical Christian to be characterized as compassionate or forbearing, but before I tell you what I heard him say, let me make clear that the brother is not just out grinding axes. Wallis, I am assured in retrospect, did not come here merely to anger the masochistic few who perhaps attended his lectures to receive their due chastisement. Burying, not grinding axes is closer to the heart of his agenda. Even those who were disturbed by his clearly apparent displeasure with America (How can we be good stewards of resources that are in reality stolen goods?) and his unwillingness to even casually bless capitalism, were not bludgeoned or capriciously dismissed. No. Jim was significantly more gentle with us than we were disposed to be with him. But this is not the point (or maybe it is).

However, as I began to say, what is really the trouble with Wallis is that he isn't just suggesting "In the event we think it might work or happen to like the idea we should move into the life-style of community, thereby experiencing renewal and restance." Rather he is saying that that's our only hope. Of course no one (I hope) doubts that the church is not what it should be. But the witness of the Sojourners fellowship and Wallis as spokesman is that what the church ought to be is something radically different from the "Constantinian" captive the church is in America, Niebuhr or Anabaptist tradition notwithstanding. For, says Wallis, "the church in America is not persecuted but seduced." And, as a Native American recently observed at a conference which Wallis attended, "Regardless of what the New Testament says, most Christians are materialists with no real experience of the Spirit." Hard words, these are.

"Faithfulness is the key word in kingdom language," asserts Wallis. That is, we are not called merely to belief, but to obedience. We are not called to an affirmation of the American cultural values of success, fame, prosperity, influence, power, but rather to a life-style consistent with the kingdom values of self-sacrifice, simplicity, justice, servanthood, in short, the way of the Cross. Pointing out that the prevailing culture considered the Early Christians atheist because they refused to worship the accepted (established) idols, Wallis poses the discomfiting question of whether or not we are similarly atheistic with regard to the manifest gods of our age. ~~We~~ we, ~~He~~ wonders, experiencing

radical discontinuity" with the values and priorities of this culture?

In his concluding lecture, Wallis argued that the Gospel is not only a call to a new way of life but to a new environment, the community of the saints. It is not kerygma, diakonia, or charisma that we need but koinonia. Sharing our property, our time, our talents which is to say, our lives, is the only hope of the healing of our own lives and those of the nations. Regardless of the "economic necessities of life together, in this society" Christians must choose life together, not autonomy. And if such a communal lifestyle is "only a viable option for a few," those few, Wallis would argue, ought to be the Body of Christ.

At this point some of you are probably wondering whether or not Jim does anything besides causing trouble. Well, I have it first hand that he likes Judy Collins and drinks beer. But no, he doesn't say everyone should.

* * W.D. Moen, the Arizonian, obviously does not agree with the Canadian Hogman that, in the words of St. Anthony quoted by Martin Luther, "If you see such a young saint clambering heavenward and planting one foot into heaven, pull him down posthaste, before he can set his other foot up there to and then plunge down head over heels into hell." * *

* * * * *

LETTERS TO JOHN HOGMAN

by Cara Davis Smith

Dear John Hogman:

Your open letter to Jim Wallis typifies, unfortunately, what is wrong not only with this nation but with much of today's organized Church.

Christ did not call us to interpret his teachings to suit our own convenience, but to follow the instructions explicit in his words.

Explicit, not implicit; we were not left room in which to maneuver. As C.S. Lewis remarked (in Mere Christianity), we must accept him and his teachings in toto or reject them in toto. If we accept him as God Incarnate, we must follow his words literally. To "interpret" them in the light of our more complex civilization is like reinterpreting the clear mandate "Thou shalt not kill" as "Don't polish off your wife or neighbor in fit of passion or greed, but to murder whole populations over an imaginary boundary line is A-okay."

For far too long people have interpreted both the Old and New Testaments to fit their immediate needs, whether in keeping women subservient (and out of the Church) or, because of variations in interpretation, condoning mass extermination of races, nations whose lands they wanted, and people who faced the wrong way to say Matins; to believe that native Africans were members of a lost tribe forever condemned by God and therefore fit only for slavery. (When that last wouldn't wash, they "interpreted" biological differences as evidence that Africans belonged to a sub-human grouping.)

The casuistry of your argument that the greater complexity of today's life, especially economic necessity precludes Christian living is self-evident. No one ever claimed it would be easy, least of all Christ, who, as I recall, paid rather a higher price for his insistence on social justice and righteousness than you or I need fear. If I recall correctly further, he said, "I bring you not peace, but a sword." You add, "The degree of social justice that this society has achieved has been based on the balancing of power between

these opposing interest groupings and not on an appeal to Christian renunciation." Considering our present level of social justice, this hardly is a recommendation that we continue to pursue our past course.

The hard fact exists that Christ called us—all of us who believe in him as the Son of God, speaking for God, sacrificing himself as God for our sins, to certain definite behavior. Where does this leave us, as persons or as nations, striving in this complex society? May I suggest that we begin, like charity, at home. We can begin with our attitudes and behavior toward our families, our friends, our colleagues, our business associates and, particularly, our enemies.

We can then, with them, reach out toward the broader community of church, business, politics. We can refuse to accept un-Christian actions by our government representatives, whether toward fellow citizens of the United States, or toward fellow citizens of the world.

The native American moved off the reservation, so that an oil company may profit from the natural resources; the child starving in Mississippi, Peru, Brazil, Africa, Asia; the person of whatever race or sex denied full growth in a free world; the native African refused admission to part of his own tribal grounds because of political or economic expedience of a usurper—every one of these sufferers is the moral responsibility of every one of us. So too is the elderly invalid left to die alone on a diet of catfood, so too the animal screaming out its life in an experiment useless to humankind and capable of proof by analog, so too those displaced for unneeded and unsafe highways and dams—but that is another ballgame.

We can refuse to purchase or watch newspapers, periodicals, television programs which carry obscene, racist, sexist materials. We can refuse to buy goods from countries which practice inhuman restraints on human beings, or wantonly slaughter intelligent beasts for their pelts or oil.

We can speak out and write our representatives against a system of justice which condones wife and child abuse as the Bible-given "right" of a husband-father, which puts children who have run away from unspeakable

homes together with seasoned criminals, which turns rapists loose on the streets without the psychiatric care they desperately need and condemns to death a child caught up in a murder committed by an adult. We can speak out against "chain-gang" justice, against neglect of the victims of crimes, against plea bargaining by wealthy criminals, against capital punishment (which makes premeditated murderers of us all).

We can even refuse to work for companies of whose policies we, as Christians, cannot approve. This last is the real rub, isn't it? The almighty buck. Yet groups of us have been practicing this for years, as well as refusing ---those of us with enough money at any one time to be interested---to invest in companies involved in such commodities as tobacco, alcohol, arms, or human suffering. Large groups. Groups like denominations, colleges, businesses. And we have discovered that although the individual pebble in the pond creates only a small ripple, the collective boulder makes an enormous splash.

We have found that, although some of us have gone to jail rather than relinquish our beliefs, none of us have been physically crucified—so far. "One with God is a majority," Whether it be one person or one group or one nation.

And please, please, don't repeat the old nonsense reflected in "Well, if we don't sell them the arms, the USSR will." That may be true, but it does not affect the quality of our personal or national integrity. Some one in the family, the group, the city, the country, the world—

someone has to take the first step. Where better than within the Church of God? To what other source do people look for moral and spiritual guidance than to those of us who have freely put themselves into positions of Christian leadership and responsibility? Not pulpit politics, agreed; but not refusal to speak out for what is, according to Christ as God Incarnate, the Word of God, truth and righteousness.

As a pastor or a Christian, or, indeed, a person who can read what past history has also taught, have you a choice?

**Ms. Davis Smith is a member of the Society of the Friends, who says, "I do not believe these things because I am a Quaker; I am a Quaker because I believe these things." **

* * * * *

EDITOR'S NOTE: It is interesting to see such concern over Christian lifestyle as demonstrated by John Hogman, Cora Davis Smith and W.P. Moen. It is more interesting to hear in all three articles the ramblings of the problem of how the Bible informs that lifestyle. All three believe that the Bible is central to Christian lifestyle. A Wal(lis) denian would argue that Hogpersons have turned sola scriptura into sola hermeneutica whereas a Hogperson would argue that the Wal(lis)denians ignore the unavoidable hermeneutical process in applying the scriptures to lifestyle. The immense gap between the first century poor Christians and twentieth century rich Americans makes the hermeneutical question particularly pressing, yet those with a strong hermeneutic invariably are charged with ignoring or perverting or subtracting the scriptures. The question which I would like Wal(lis)denians and Hogpersons to debate on is "in the step from the Bible passage to a full, modern Christian lifestyle, how do we proceed with faithfulness to both the Bible and the modern American situation"?

* * * * *

FORUM ON THE GOSPEL:

CONTINUING THE DIALOGUE

with W.D.Moen

by Mark Carlson

In the first issue of Viewpoint we were "blessed" to have not one but two articles to begin the forum on the Gospel. The unforeseen contribution by W.D. Moen ("Jesus come to America") vividly satirized current evangelism which debases free grace. However, he leaves us with the uneasy question of "How do we preach free grace without making it cheap?" I hope Judas' final suggestion that we sell salvation is presented just as lightly as the other suggestions. Not only is it blatant works-righteousness, but it also opens the door to another satirical article on how we sell salvation with strings attached a la Jim Wallis. As Luther repeatedly affirmed, when the preaching and scripture are seen as nothing but examples of Christ which we must obey or work for, "there neither the gospels or epistles may be read in a profitable or Christian manner, and (people) remain as pagan as ever." Grace which we buy is not Grace at all.

Perhaps a look at the parable of the Hidden Treasure can shed some light on our question. This parable is usually read like "someone goes out in a field, finds a hidden treasure and sells everything to get the treasure." A typical evangelistic sermon might preach about the tremendous price of the hidden treasure and ring out an inspiring challenge to sell all we have and obtain the "pearl of Christ". Everything is nice, logical, challenging, inspiring, but wrong.

STUDENT GOVERNMENT BACKGROUNDPAPER FORTRUSTEE-STUDENT CONSULTATION (Nov.15)

Instead of God's free gift of incomprehensible love has become a prudent human transaction: capitalism on a cross. Despite any rhetoric about "gospel", "grace", even "free grace"—after all God didn't have to go around planting hidden treasure — the entire lesson and sermon has drunk the dregs of works-righteousness to the bottom. It is not surprising that Bonhoeffer's interpretation of these parables in the Cost of Discipleship hardly improves on this "Let's make a Deal" evangelism.

In the Parables of Jesus, after describing how the parables are 'completely misunderstood' if interpreted as Jesus' call for complete surrender, Jeremias writes, " the key words are rather apo tes charas (for sheer joy;NEB). When that great joy, surpassing all measure, seizes man, it carries him away, penetrates his inmost being.... the decisive thing in the twin parable (of Pearl and Treasure) is not what the two men give up, but the reason for their doing so; the overwhelming experience of the splendor of their discovery. Thus it is with the Kingdom of God." (p. 201) If we can wade through Jeremias' sexist language, we can see that the overwhelming jubilation at finding the treasure and the pearl so captures the discoverer's lives that whatever else they possessed became worthless, as cheap as dust. "Selling all" is not the cost of discipleship but the happy jettison of worthless baggage. Perhaps the best exegesis of those parables and, at the same time, the confession of one of the finders comes from Paul in Phil. 3:7-8: "But whatever gain I had, I counted as loss for the sake of Christ. Indeed I count everything as loss because of the surpassing worth of knowing Christ Jesus my Lord." When Christ calls someone, he does not bid "come and die", he bids "come and live for the first time in your life."

How then shall we preach free grace? Surely not by talking on the Law as a rider clause on salvation. The Law has its place but not in salvation and if we take Mr. Moen's article seriously, neither can we preach a Grace which merely laminates a 'Jesus-coat' on everything as it stands. Rather a starting point for preaching free grace can be the preaching of a Grace which so overflow our hearts and minds with joy that it renders all else unimportant. Free Grace transcends both cheapness and costliness.

As is all too well known by most of us, student-trustee relations at Princeton Seminary have been somewhat strained for various structural proposals to integrate student input into the operations of the Board, and various issue-oriented recommendations to subcommittees within the Board. A "communication gap" might be a polite phrase for some of this history; probably repetitive to most trustees, frustrating to most students. Students and trustees have different ranges of memory at work of course; trustees may wonder if students will ever learn, students may wonder why they seem to be always forgotten or ignored. And, however much irresponsibility, intransigence, or impatience students may have shown, both groups would probably agree that ignorance has been the most pervasive problem. Acknowledging this spotted past, we look forward to this meeting for a constructive time, hoping to work -- before any particular issues--on the question of trust. Our only assumption is that trustees, if not parts of the community, are at least part of the institution, and that we thus share a concern for the human and academic as well as financial resources of our seminary.

* * * * *

Understood as an issue, Student-Trustee relations have a largely symbolic importance, relating to the openness of the Seminary's decision-making process in general. Obviously, the structure is not seen as an open one: there are opportunities for discussion and even some for inquiry, But the final stages of the process often seem to trivialize all of the preceeding dialogue. In any case, though, students feel that they have been moving slowly and steadily over the past two years in the Student Government, the Viewpoint, and increasingly in other campus organizations, and that an orientation to the institution as a whole gradually has been developed. In doing this we have tried to avert certain usual and predictable cycles of response, reaction and resentment as we hope to do in the area of response, reaction and resentment as we hope to do in the area of student-trustee relations. Speaking as stewards of student abilities and energies, then, we in principle advocate structures of mutual accountability. In practice, we consider them essential to the development of student responsibility and to the broader educational functions of the institution.

In the agenda below we indicate that we do not wish to spend all of our 1½-2 hours on procedural or structural matters, though these are basic. We have a number of items that we'd like to discuss and have drawn up an outline that hopefully will enable both groups to present their concerns. We would here formally request any materials from the recent Board meeting that might help us understand the considerations and assumptions going into the long-range planning decisions (which to our knowledge are the focus of the October meeting), and also request copies of whatever forecasts have been developed. We may also prepare supplementary materials in one or two areas, though for the purposes of our general ombudsmanship for the student body, the Viewpoint may also be considered background material.

Proposed Agenda

For Nov. 15th meeting between 5 students and 5 trustees and the President of the Seminary)

- Opening remarks and introductions
- [Campus Perspectives (15 minutes)
 - a. Women: Women's Center goals, present work.
 - b. Black/Third World interests.

- c. General Student foci, involvements.
- III Trustee Concerns (20-30 minutes) relating to materials requested, but also to any interests of those trustees present.
- IV Student Concerns (30 minutes)
 - a. Portfolio (review of previous agreement)
 - 1. access
 - 2. guidelines: WCC and UPC concerns for corporate responsibility. (we have a June 1970 Statement of Policy of Finance and Investment Committee, as well as much material from the Church, other seminaries and universities, and the ICCR.
- V Continued Student-Trustee Dialogue (30 minutes)
 - a. Further structural concern; two case studies
 - 1. Alexander Hall decisions
 - 2. Campus Pastor proposals
 - b. Future of the consultation
 - 1. Next date
 - 2. Who comes
 - 3. Information prepared.

Adjournment.

* * * * *

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN

Students chronically complain that the student government is ineffective and that students have no voice in the administrative decision-making process. However a critical hindrance to strong student voice has been a lack of cooperation with and accountability to the student government on the part of the students on the faculty-student committees. This year the student government called a meeting of all students on all these committees on October 18. Of the 30-35 students on the committees, only four showed up for the meeting. I personally drove over an hour and a half to get to ^{pts} only to wait around for an extra three hours for a meeting that never came off. It is time for students who did not show up to get on the ball. The committees are designed to help students have real input, not to act as a vehicle for brown-nosing professors or making dossiers look better. Please show some responsibility either by coming to meetings or by resigning.

Greg Hall

** Although the other three representatives did not have to drive three hours, we can sure they hold the same opinion of the phenomenal display of sense of responsibility on October 18. Unfortunately, we can not be as sure that all appointed students received notification before hand.

* * * * *

UPDATE

Campus Pastor: Student government has formally expressed its interest in obtaining a description of the proposal for a campus pastor. Apparently funding may be as yet unsettled, leaving the issue still tenuous.

South Africa: In the evening discussion between Dr. James McCord and Bishop Kibira, both church leaders expressed concern for the situation in South Africa, especially because of its meaning on the ecumenical witness of the Church. Upon questioning Bishop Kibira, from Tanzania, supported divestment.

Announcement: The Coalition of Seminarians against Apartheid-- a subcommittee of the social action committee -- is pleased to announce the showing of the movie "Apartheid: Twentieth Century Slavery" followed by an informed discussion of the dimensions of one problem and its effect on us at Princeton Seminary. This will take place on Friday night, the 10th, at 7:30.

The editor sincerely apologizes the final appearance of this issue of VIEWPOINT. Because of unexpected multiple calamities, the services of three typists were devoured alive in trying to get VIEWPOINT to exist in even this form. I would like to thank all those who laid their fingers on the chopping block and their feet on the gas pedal in this extraordinary enterprise. Barring further interventions of the wrath of the seven angels upon VIEWPOINT, this journal will return to its intended style next issue.

viewpoint

Vol. 17, No. 4

November 24, 1978

FORUM ON THE GOSPEL:

MISSIONS AT PTS (Part I)

By Mark Carlson

If John Wilbur thinks that social action concerns are suppressed, I think that concern among students about church mission and evangelism is just plainly ignored. At least social action attracts attention, even excitement among a dedicated few. The mere words "overseas missions" and "evangelism" lock any conversation in a casket (exception, perhaps, among a few evangelicals). This is unfortunate. Princeton Seminary used to graduate nearly 50% of its students into the overseas mission fields. Professor Emeritus George Sweazey commented in an interview that "THE" decision when he went to seminary was whether one felt called overseas or at home. Former President MacKay virtually embodied mission and evangelism. But the greatest misfortune for this general 'ho-hum' is that new stirrings are happening now initiated by the administration and requiring attention and consideration. The next few installments of the "forum" will highlight these areas of concern on campus along with commentary from an interview with President McCord.

A new thrust in the area of mission and evangelism is being made and perhaps the most substantial portion of this thrust is the new creation of a chair in evangelism and mission. A chair in missions used to exist, but under the MacKay administration the name was changed to "ecumenics." Richard Shaull currently on sabbatical, and probably considering retirement, holds this chair. Not all students look to Dr. Shaull as a leader in evangelism. The creation of the new senior faculty position for evangelism and missions is a true move of leadership and progressive concern on the part of the Board of Trustees. (The Board is approaching the endowment goal and President McCord expressed his personal hope that the chair would be filled by next September). As a major focal point on campus where dialogue on church mission and evangelism is taking place, the creation of this chair can be used as a point of insight into the dialogue itself:

(cont. page 2)

CONTENTS - Part IForum on the Gospel:

Missions at PTS (Part I)
by Mark Carlson

The Sun of God

by George "Yorgos" Cladis

Introduction to Christian Economics:

A Rejoinder
by Peter Ferriby

Out of the Closet and Under the Rug

by Stephen Smith

Poem

by W.D. Moen

Viewpoint is an informal journal of frank and creative discussion published by the students of Princeton Theological Seminary. Essays, poetry, stories, commentary, and graphics are all welcome--though the editor reserves the right not to publish certain contributions. The opinions expressed in Viewpoint are simply those of its contributors and do not necessarily reflect the official position of the Seminary or of the editorial staff. Issues are published every two weeks. It is best to photostat copies of any material submitted as it tends to get marked up in the process of editing. The Viewpoint Box is in the administration building.

Part II* Seminary Concerns *Reflections on an Interview

with Suzanne Rudiselle
by Sharon Esposito

Staff:Editor & Senior Associates:

Mark Carlson, John Hogman, Mark Durrett

Other Associates:

Paul Rack, W.D. Moen, Gregory Hall
Nick Boolukos

UPDATE

Cont. from page 1-

When asked why the move to create a chair in mission and evangelism was imperative, President McCord gave an answer to which I give a hearty amen. He is absolutely right that there is no longer a collective theology in America. America is suffering a "crisis of confidence," "a crisis of faith." No longer is there the burning belief that "at the name of Jesus every knee should bow and every tongue confess that

Jesus Christ is Lord." Dr. McCord observed that the real moratorium on mission is in the U.S., not the third world. I add that the American moratorium is further complicated by current association of evangelism with superficial techniques (and particularly what Martin Marty calls "electric evangelism").

We can be thankful that a primary criterion in the selection of the person for the chair is that he/she understand and interpret evangelism

d mission in its theological context with depth and radiance, not with a magic bag of gimmicks. McCord could not agree with President McCord more emphatically on virtually every point; unfortunately, dialogue from another corner--from international students and the seminary's own Institutional Self-Evaluation Report (ISE May 1, 1977)--complicates the discussion. And the identity and mission of Princeton Seminary itself is at stake in this dialogue and decision.

The ISE report speaks mainly of seminary identity in relation to plurality. However, more intrinsic to identity is mission: The church's identity is determined as much as by its calling, its goals and direction, its active service as by its statically viewed constituency. And a serious question for PTS is "What is this seminary's mission." President McCord is obviously right that the primary mission of PTS is (and may always be) to the American situation, currently very desperate. But what responsibility does PTS have towards the church's mission overseas? Princeton has never made the narrow-minded mistake of selfishly limiting its mission to "we Christians in America." In fact, as I reported in the opening paragraph, PTS has always been proud of and extremely strong in its responsibility for the international church. This concern is one of the greatest signs of health throughout Princeton's history. And despite the drastic change in the mission situation and the current trend of American students to serve American pastorates, Princeton has maintained that concern and responsibility. President McCord could unashamedly say that PTS spends more money in training Third World leadership than any other seminary in America and invites far more international students (e.g. Yale, Union, Va., 12, PTS, 52; how this reflects the current overseas mission situation will be discussed next issue). The ISE report places the problem not so much in

concern and responsibility as in lack of design. Linking an absence of dialogue with the seminary's hierarchical structure, mode of government and centralized communication (a slightly simplistic analysis, I think), the report records its fear that pluralism on campus may be due more to unrelated ad hoc decisions than to thoroughly discussed, long-range planning. It cites as examples, conditions in the international situation which echo frequently among students themselves and which bear directly upon the Missions chair issue. I summarize three key items:

1) A school cannot express aggressive concern for international mission in one area--in admitting students--and fail to exhibit comparable concern (the report labels it "anti-pluralistic") in parallel areas, specifically in hiring teachers. The obvious imbalance must be carefully thought through. A seminary which actively seeks to represent in some degree the world body of Christ in the student population should also do so in its faculty;

2) Students from international ministries must be assured that those who will train them have a sufficient grasp of the ministry situation to which they will return. It is counter-productive to give an African student skills for an American suburban parish. The ISE report even goes so far as to mention "provincialism" and to link the student's charge of "ivory tower" mentality to a large degree of this problem. One international student also mentioned creativity and growth comes from dialogue among different backgrounds and positions; an international teacher would be "a breath of fresh air," as he put it.

3) Consequently, the ISE report states that many international students feel that the "International atmosphere" of PTS is shallow and pretentious. Their unique view is frequently served but not easily heard. They have no established focal point and resource in facing the tremendous difficulties of

culture shock, language obstacles and degree program adjustments.

It is not amazing that international students would feel that a first step towards overcoming these weaknesses, towards demonstrating more long-range planning in acting responsibly towards the seminary's mission internationally, and towards enriching PTS's identity as a major world seminary, would be the addition of a full-time teacher from the Third World. And the ISE report assures that, Princeton, having such institutional strength already, is one of the few denominational schools in the country which can encourage variety without losing its identity (p. 105). Few other schools can maintain a strong and thoughtfully developed international mission training alongside a substantial emphasis on national ministries. And the current state of America's international missions would seem to be a mandate for constructive efforts in seminaries today.

Considering the strength of arguments for American mission and international mission, a certain dilemma exists in making decisions about the mission of Princeton Seminary. Carefully thought-out and openly discussed decisions on both mission areas must occur especially NOW. Particular circumstances probably will determine to a great extent the decision about the chair in Evangelism, but if, as Dean Nichols reported, over the current twelve months until next fall, one quarter of the faculty at PTS will become new faces, special concern for responsibility for both American and international missions must be shown in this major reshaping of our faculty.

THE SUN OF GOD

By George "Yorgos" Cladis

I believe it was Karl Barth who said that the Christian pastor ought to have the Bible in one hand and a newspaper in the other. If we were to carefully exegete this now legendary proverb, to historically and critically attempt to re-create the environment in which it was uttered, we cannot fail to conclude that Barth must have assumed that in order to read either Amos or Abigail van Buren the presence of light is a pre-requisite.

"Well, of course," you say, "how obvious", you say; that is just the point! For too long we have taken the sun (or those poor imitations of ours that Edison dreamed up) for granted!

The seminarian's mind (when employed) seems to be predominantly geared toward the theological maintenance of the church; for, though Christ sustains the church, some exercise of theology directs it within limits. However, many of us are also finding that noble aim somewhat linked, at this time, to the physical maintenance of church buildings. Though it may sound mundane, the parish pastor, along with his Bible and newspaper, will often be seen with a wrench in his back pocket or paint spots on his Sunday shoes.

For years, practical solar energy never made it past a handful of eccentric research physicists' blackboards or beyond the dreams of science fiction writers (even Jules Verne!). However, the fuminous blazing ball that, curiously enough, has been so consistent in its daily advent (the result of prayerful Brahmans), yet so rarely relied upon in terms of energy, is now being harnessed for heating and cooling purposes in homes, businesses and, yes!, even churches.

There are basically two ways solar energy can be used to heat the water and/or air of a home or church:

active and passive. Active systems apply one or a combination of fans, vents, pipes and pumps to circulate through occupied space air or water that has been heated in solar collectors. A passive system leaves out a lot of the fancy hardware and relies more on a direct transmission of heat through wall or ceiling and often controlled with adjustable panels or flaps.

The active system is by far the more wearisome on the church budget and, at this time, is not an economically feasible undertaking unless a new plant or extensive building renovation is planned.

A passive system can often simply be "recognized". You know those huge windows in the Youth Center? Installing proper curtains or flaps could save your church family a bundle that they might rather want to send to the Hunger Fund, Major Mission Fund or other mission concerns and not the local utility. Furthermore, a passive system can be cheaply designed into renovation plans or new plant designs by simply taking into consideration such factors as southern exposure, landscaping (don't plant that oak in front of the windows!), and I would not advise scrimping on construction materials or leaving out suitable insulation - that will cost you more in the long run.

The savings that you, the session, deaconate and members will want to know about vary from place to place. Solar heated homes and businesses (with standby gas or electric heating and cooling units) on an average can operate 50%-75% of the time on solar energy alone (the conventional units kick on when the solar unit is "exhausted" due to bad weather conditions). In dry and fair weather towns such as Boulder, Colo., or Davis, Calif. (where there are more registered bicycles than automobiles), solar heated homes, apartment houses and businesses are commonplace. They operate on 85%-95% solar energy and therefore the

initial investment in solar units can be paid back in a short time from the savings on utility bills.

My intern church here in Natchez, Miss., spent \$10,000 on heating and cooling the church buildings in one year. For our location, using figures of 60% solar efficiency for absorption solar cooling and 80% for solar heating, that utility bill could have been as low as \$3000. The \$7000 difference could have gone to pay for the increased mortgage due to the addition of the solar unit (if not paid for initially) - a mortgage that would be paid off in ten to fifteen years producing considerable energy savings. To invest in solar energy is to invest in the future physical maintenance of the church.

And that physical maintenance finds its way back to a theological maintenance. Solar energy means a cleaner environment; it means a community that had foresight and vision and leadership; it means the faith community can be less concerned about maintaining itself through costly and inflating bills and be more concerned about channeling resources to needy mission concerns. It is a nitty gritty way of proclaiming that the church community need not be so much a field for mission as a force for mission.

Solar energy units are currently installed in thousands of homes and businesses including a large newspaper firm and an Anhauser-Busch brewery. In addition, I know of seven churches that employ solar systems that range from the Mt. Zion Baptist Church in Norfolk, Va., to the Jehovah's Witnesses Kingdom Hall in Seward, Neb., from the Christian Reform Church of Hope in Westminster, Co., to the Westgate Assembly of God in Boise, Id.

If you would like to know more about solar energy, from basics to blueprints, I can suggest two good sources (there are many more). The first is the National Solar Heating and Cooling Information Center. They can answer just about any solar question you can hurl at them, give you an excellent indexed bibliography

and even give you addresses and phone numbers of solar heated churches. They can be reached at (toll free) 800-523-2929 (in Penna. call 800-462-4983). Have them put you on their newsletter mailing list.

Another reliable source of solar information can be obtained by writing "The Mother Earth News", PO Box 70, Hendersonville, NC, 28739. These folks can plug you into the design experts on solar units, instruct you on how to build a solar hot water heater for \$35, tell you where local solar talent is located, etc.

Most importantly, remember the sun. We must no longer take its presence for granted. As a church we believe the Son is our salvation yet the sun can help salvage us in an era of expensive energy!

** Another correspondence from our dedicated field staff! Alexander Hall recently replaced a multitude of 75 watt bulbs with 25 watt bulbs--a change which is supposed to save \$1000 a year. Has someone been intercepting Viewpoint correspondence?

INTRODUCTORY CHRISTIAN ECONOMICS: A REJOINDER

by "Cosmic Pete" Ferriby

Servant of God has chance
of greater sin
And sorrow, than the man who
serves a king.
For those who serve the greater
cause may make the cause
serve them,
Still doing right: and striving
with political men
May make that cause political,
not by what they do
But by what they are.

T.S. Eliot, Murder in the Cathedral

The first thing about Christian economics is that there is no such think. There is economics, of course, and there are (or so one would hope) Christians. There are both Christians who reflect economically and those who fulfill economic laws in their daily business in the community. The economist is in an analagous situation to the theologian: the economist reflects on the experience of the marketplace, he or she "keeps up with what's happening in the market", as a theologian reflects on the experience of the community of faith and "keeps up with what's breaking in grace." There are theologians who are economic units just as there are economists who are, in some limited sense at the very least, theologians. Thus, there are Christians who reflect economically, but to speak of "Christian economics" is to set up a straw person.

A Christian who reflects both economically and theologically is the critical nexus in this essay. "Between the Bible and the Wall Street Journal" how is one to remain faithful and realistic simultaneously? (It is freely granted that that image reflects both Reformed theology and capital theory, two subjects which, like morals and venereal disease, have a long and intimate history together.) For the Christian economist immediately to go gunning after institutions is, bluntly, off the point: for both the sustaining grace of God and capital theory have sought historically some institutional framework. While institutions may be difficult it is hyperbolic (and perhaps just hyper) to say that they are per se evil (else one also reifies evil, the fault of the Manicheans). The question thus resolves to, not whether institutions, but whether legitimate institutions?

It is a melancholy fact indeed, that wherever the church has become institutionally most entrenched, the sustaining grace of God has been ignored. Given the present chaos and inertia in the institutional church,

question for many then becomes, best can one keep the institutional options open so as to allow the God who pounces? In my church (U.C.C.) we face a frank mission that we have no theological justification for our political structure. That can be a weakness (and mean huge telephone bills); it can also be a strength, for we aren't tempted to ecclesial triumphalism, Evangelical or Catholic.

How can we scale down our institutions? It may indeed be true, as Paul Rack and Thomas Pynchon suggest, that by institutions we have, with good (first) intentions, turned the world into a large concentration camp. At Dachau in Germany, they put a Carmelite convent in the remains of the camp. How can we do likewise?

OUT OF THE CLOSET AND UNDER THE RUG

by Stephen Smith

It has been suggested that the issue of homosexuality has been resolved in the Presbyterian Church. With a resounding 'no', General Assembly stated that self-affirmed homosexuals would be denied ordination into the ministry. Thus, the matter is closed, Pandora's box is slammed shut and closely guarded by a sentry of Chicago Klan-entrenched theologians and psychologists. But let me crack the lid again for a moment.

Upon returning from a year's internship, I was told that I missed the action last year; that spring of 1978 was the time when TS seminarians wrestled with their sexual identities, with many discovering (to no one's surprise) that there was something inherently odd in their heterosexual orientation, while still others discovered (to everyone's surprise) that their sexual orientation had very little to say about godliness,

much less, moral behavior. I had hoped, therefore, to find the issue of sexuality firmly resolved in the hearts and minds of the veterans of last spring.

For those who opposed the ordination of homosexually-oriented men/women, I had hoped that theological and moral seriousness had gone into discerning the godliness of their sexual orientation or that heterosexual relationships in some way could be shown to exemplify that godliness over against those homosexual relationships under condemnation; that the psychoanalytical claims that homosexual orientation categorically constituted a pathological disorder could be upheld by a demonstration of what good personal (and I dare say, normal) living is in the straight world, or that these folk at least understood their sexuality well enough to condemn a variance of that understanding.

It was not to be so. Sexuality was not the issue, neither was the issue one of biblical revelation or pathological disorientation. Again, as in so many other instances, resulting out of our strangely arrested moral conscience, the issue was the inability to accept others because of their difference. Where others had questioned the status of full humanity for those of pigmentation difference, gender difference, or age difference, here in no less way the full humanity of those in our number was questioned because of sexual orientation difference.

In a way, it comes as no surprise. The UPUSA's decision, no matter how extensively it included provisions for the advocacy of civil rights for gays, was well in line with the political drift of the past several months in this country. Propelled by the reactionary avalanche which preceded it, G.A.'s move was in step with the defeat of E.R.A. ratification in Illinois, Proposition 13 in California, the Bakke Decision, and the repeal of Gay Ordinances in Wichita, St. Paul, Eugene, and Miami. Do not think that the differences of race,

gender, and socio-economic class did not play a part in these political debacles!

Enough. It was not on campus in the spring. Nor was I in San Diego in May. My limited awareness of these events in many ways limits my ability to comment on them. But I was in the St. Paul Hotel ballroom in April when the returns filed in on the referendum to permit discrimination in renting and employment on the basis of sexual orientation. With a two to one count for the referendum, I watched as parents and children, brothers and sisters, lovers and friends wept in despair. Civil rights had unraveled for one part of the citizenry, and in doing so, there was no guarantee that the civil rights of any weaker constituency could be protected against the stronger. It is a terrifying precedent. As we marched that night through the streets of St. Paul to throw flowers of condolence on City Hall's seat of justice, chanting "No more holocausts, no, never again," I could not help but see in the seething hatred and spitting crowds which surrounded us the face of Nazi Germany in 1939. Because of difference.

It is a time to be vigilant. But it is also a time to be morally serious. Our moral stature and maturity will not be determined ultimately by our piety or our eloquent defense of theological positions, nor will it evolve out of our ability to discern sexual norms from biblical revelation. It is determined, rather, in our ability to absorb the paradox that all people are both different and equal. If we forget this simple but essential truth, our relations with others are necessarily inferior and debilitating.

The issue of homosexuality for Presbyterians is all but resolved. It is inextricably bound to the issues of sexism and racism insofar as its societal subjugation is founded upon fear

and ignorance. We remain morally stunted as we continue to theologically or clinically justify inequality on the basis of difference. Immorality does not consist in being different, it consists in not allowing others to be so. This is no less true as one approaches the altar of the Most High, as it is in our political and social milieu. Our response as the church to homosexuality measures the poverty of our moral state. We will not improve upon that state until we face again the fear which blinds us. The fear of difference.

** Steve Smith is a middler and one of the daring souls living in the wilds of Trenton. It should be noted that there is currently a bill (S1276) before the N.J. Senate Committee on Judiciary which would make homosexual acts a criminal offense. For further information, contact the Social Action Committee.

POEM - O Beautiful For

by W.D. Moen

opulent poverty
 assesses
 the land. Affluent
 upers
 golf carts and
 ambo jets
 rsue their holy grail,
 lf-interest,
 citing in their
 antom litany an
 firmation of
 during faith in
 fe, liberty and
 ee enterprise. Across
 e face of a
 olen continent they
 read God's grace
 ke a
 cnic blanket, spilling
 meone else's
 unty into their own
 xious hands.

*

vilization, they
 lled it, land of
 dustrial
 pitalism and
 e homeless
 ave. From
 e sea to
 e other
 ey surged like an
 land tide
 aving
 ctories and
 eeways
 their wake;
 rvesting where they
 d not
 wn:
 ndfall profits.

*

portunity,
 owth,
 ogress,



the shibboleths of
 a frenzied race
 resounded from the lips
 of the
 successfully
 selfish, cunning men
 who bargained
 savagely with
 innocents... Barbarians
 bearing gifts.
 With the brutal
 grasp
 of the
 ignorant
 they tamed the
 land.
 Like pagans in
 the temple
 they defiled the
 sacred. Paha Sapa
 gone.

*

Now,
 smug in their
 unnoticed poverty,
 the faithful
 sacrifice themselves
 on the altar
 of
 GNP, their standard of
 dying.
 Blinded by a desperate
 belief in
 discredited dogmas,
 they worship the
 fatal comfort
 of
 Godless elegance,
 the opiate
 of
 the affluent.
 See them kneel:
 spiritual
 paraplegics
 in
 Sunday clothes.

SEMINARY CONCERNS

REFLECTIONS ON AN INTERVIEW WITH
SUZANNE RUDISELLE

by Sharon Esposito

I was 20 minutes late for our interview, I had forgotten the cassette for the tape recorder and, after finally procuring a cassette, turning on the recorder and settling down for our interview, I discovered 30 minutes into our discussion that the machine had not been working. It was not one of my better days. It was the first time I'd ever interviewed anyone--it will probably be the last. And so, the point of all of this is that I am doing a "reflection" on our interview rather than a verbatim (sorry Sandy Brown). But, it's just as well. It seems, Ms. Rudiselle, that I feel it is important for others to understand the way you relate to people and to describe how it feels to talk with you rather than simply exclusively relating verbatim what you had to say.

I know before our interview that your position here is Assistant Director of Professional Studies. But you dealt with the initial logistical chaos and confusion of our interview in such a very gentle and pastoral way and you began talking about your understanding of your job in such a way that it made me curious about what your background was. You said you graduated from here in 1976, were ordained, and for the past two years had been Assistant Pastor of the Flemington Presbyterian Church. You mentioned that your work at Flemington involved leading small groups, extensive counseling and focused largely on ministry to

young adults.

Yes, I was beginning to get a sense of how you see your role here. Your main job responsibilities include academics and professional development. Yet your focus seems to be not only on isolated academic concerns, but rather, on the student as a whole individual. I was pleased to see that. And I was pleased to hear you say that you are "happily surprised with the caliber of the students here," not necessarily only academically, but with their willingness to seek new possibilities and to accept the challenge of personal growth. You said you thought you saw some very positive changes since you graduated in regard to people being more gentle with each other, and students not only seeking pastoral care for themselves but offering it to one another. I felt you were sensitive to the students desire and hope for change. You said there is a point and a legitimacy to being angry and trying to bring about change, but it is important to know what the priorities are, because being angry and expressing it does not necessarily affect change. "There are ways of affecting change, but the best possible way of doing that may not be from an angry stance." You mentioned your concern about the competition inherent in this place and wondered out loud about the issue of and tension between a theology of competition and Christianity.

There was a lot of substance to what you had to say. But what I was left with was how you said what you did and how I felt about your obvious commitment to your responsibilities here. I believe you have a lot to offer this community and on behalf of it--we welcome you back.

** Sharon is the first woman in at least two years, to penetrate the sexist Viewpoint staff and bring a much needed diversity--not only a feminine 'viewpoint' but, moreover, a unique pastoral concern of her own. We thank Sharon for introducing Ms. Rudiselle to us and hope we can get to know her better.

UPDATE

Meeting With the Trustees:

Five students selected by Student Government had a very favorable meeting with the Trustees Wednesday, November 15. Concrete actions moved were:

- 1) Access to the seminary portfolio by a student, Rich McDermott, appears fairly certain, pending January's Trustee Meeting;
- 2) The Trustees were open to Student Government's proposing of guidelines for investment;
- 3) The Trustees asked for suggestions for student involvement in fund raising (student government will reply within three weeks);
- 4) Another meeting was agreed upon, with specific date, yet to be determined.

Far more important than these concrete moves was the establishing of a favorable and open relationship with the Trustees which could lead to major steps forward for all concerned.

Open Meeting Of Seminary Conference:

President McCord reported that prospects for a campus pastor were very good but that it would probably require the usual 3-4 years to raise the \$111,500 Major Mission money (and, therefore, get a pastor). The position itself would be a three-year, experimental, administrative appointment, related to the Dean of the Seminary. Considering that it was reported that the precise form of student participation in the process of drawing a job description and calling the individual has not yet been thought about, concrete steps towards defining student input should start now---not in three years.

Authorization has been given for a junior faculty position in

Church History, probably for early church history including Greek Patristics. Hopefully, that position will be filled by next fall along with the chair in Evangelism, an Old Testament replacement for Dr. Fritsch, a New Testament replacement for Dr. Juel and the arrival of Dr. Ryerson in the Department of History of Religions.

Miller Chapel:

Strong Criticism has been registered with Viewpoint about the flagrant ignoring of the non-sexist guidelines for hymn language by worshippers and about particular preachers' use of "fast and loose brides" and other examples. Although the specific "one-liners" submitted will not be printed, concern for the laxity in worship is justly expressed.

viewpoint

Vol. 17, No. 5

December 12, 1978

THE DOOR THAT CLOSES

By Rev. Dr. Paul Meyer

Scripture Lesson: Luke 13:22-30 (RSV)

Some years ago the Columbia Broadcasting System devoted one of its special broadcasts to an "Essay on Doors." In what was at once a lighthearted whimsy and a kind of reflective visual and audio prose poem, the commentator, followed by the moving television camera, sauntered from one kind of door to another, opening, closing, demonstrating and talking about: the warmly-lit and inviting front door of a home; a much more heavily used kitchen screen door, with its long spring and the unforgettable sound of its slamming shut; a revolving door, simultaneously inhaling and exhaling customers of some busy emporium; a mysterious closet-door; a conversational Dutch door; a tricky pair of louvered swinging doors--and many more.

One could conduct a comparable tour of Biblical doors, and find a similar variety of denotation and connotation. A few, just within the New Testament, are: the temple doors, in one place shading a crippled beggar who arrested the passing apostles, and in another slammed shut to keep out Paul and the supposed defilement of his non-Jewish companions on the sacred precincts; the visionary door through which the seer of Revelation is admitted to the throne of heaven and its surrounding worship; the figurative door of missionary opportunity opened for Paul in Ephesus; the door of death and decay, shut and opened by the rolling of a great stone; the prison doors, from which here an earthquake and there an angel set apostles free; the gates of hades, signaling the domain of an alien and hostile power; the door to the sheepfold, serving to test whether the one who enters is a real shepherd or an imposter; Jesus himself, the door to salvation; or the door of the hearer's indifferent heart, upon which the words of Jesus are a knock, a persevering, a persisting, a pressing knock.

One of these words of Jesus, which supplies our text, has itself to do with a door. Not two doors, mark you, one leading to life and the other to death, but one door, which is eventually a closed door. The only question about what kind of door is which side of it a person is on, for a closed door has only two sides: an inside and an outside.

(cont. page 2)

CONTENTS - Part I

The Door That Closes

By Rev. Dr. Paul Meyer

Council of Theological Seminaries

By Marcia Myers

Part II

* Seminary Concerns *

Mission and PTS

By Christine Amjad-Ali

Report on the Trustee-Student Con-
sultation

Poem

By W.D. Moen

Poem

By Elsie A. McKee

The Campus Pastor Debate

By Mark Carlson

Proposed Guidelines For Investment
Policy

A Commentary on the Guidelines

By Chris Iosso

Field Education Placement Changes

Untitled

By Sue Reisinger

Staff:

Editor & Senior Associates:

Mark Carlson, John Hogman, Mark
Durrett

Other Associates:

Paul Rack, W.D. Moen, Gregory Hall,
Nick Boolukos, Sharon Esposito

Viewpoint is an informal journal of frank and creative discussion published by the students of Princeton Theological Seminary. Essays, poetry, stories, commentary, and graphics are all welcome--though the editor reserves the right not to publish certain contributions. The opinions expressed in Viewpoint are simply those of its contributors and do not necessarily reflect the official position of the Seminary or of the editorial staff. Issues are published every two weeks. It is best to photostat copies of any material submitted as it tends to get marked up in the process of editing. The Viewpoint Box is in the administration building.

Cont. from page 1-

There is nothing particularly unclear about the parable. Jesus is asked to respond to a standard religious question of his day: whether in the end only a few will turn out to be saved. His reply is to speak of salvation as a door which God opens and human beings must enter, a door that opens only from the inside. And it is a narrow door: it takes some struggle and effort to get in; one cannot simply stroll leisurely through it! If some do not enter, that is not because God is unwilling to admit them, but because they fail to meet the terms which the door itself imposes, and the running themes of Jesus' teaching in the Synoptic tradition make clear what that involves: salvation cannot be taken for granted; it is not enough to say "We have Abraham as our father"; the very presence of God's open door poses the demand for a response to Him, for obedience and the pursuit of his righteousness!

Even more important: this door is not rusted open permanently. A time comes when the door is shut, when it is too late for even the most strenuous effort to gain access. The last verses vividly contrast what goes on inside and outside this closed door. Inside is light and joy; here the

patriarchs and prophets, and people from every quarter of the world sit down at the Messianic Banquet in the Kingdom of God. Outside there is darkness and despair. "Weeping and gnashing of teeth" in this context is hardly an expression of remorse and fear--but the grinding fury of frustration on the part of those who thought they had some right to get in. This fury is their punishment, for the Kingdom of God always turns things inside out. "I tell you, I do not know where you come from." The reality of God and his repudiation is far more shattering than any silence of God ever could be; it always upsets the calculations of those who believe they have some prescriptive right to God's favor. "Yes, and some who are now last will be first, and some who are first will be last."

Of course it has always been possible for some Christian folk to remain untouched by the sight of this closed door, to make out that they are the ones inside and that those who stand outside are someone else: the Jews of Jesus' own day, or the Roman Catholics of the time of the Reformation, or someone else today. Luke shows a profounder dimension to his Gospel, to his Christian faith, when he does not merely repeat the parable and let it go at that. Instead, he introduces into the frantic conversation that goes on through the closed door precisely the uniquely Christian version of this false security, the last-ditch appeal on the part of those who are outside to the historical presence of Jesus! "Then you will begin to say, 'We ate and drank in your presence, and you taught in our streets.'" "Come on, Lord! We still sit at our communion tables with you. We have more than heard, we have studied and learned the teachings you gave while you lived on this earth of ours. Doesn't that count for anything?" "I tell you, I do not know where you come from; depart from me, all you workers of iniquity." By itself, an appeal to Jesus is in no

respect different from an appeal to Abraham--and it does not matter under what theological banner the appeal is made.

This is a frightening door, this closed door, a profoundly unsettling door. One can leaf through the whole Gospel of Luke, through the whole New Testament, searching for some detour around it, some last hinged panel in this door to squeeze through, to relieve the finality of it. And there is none. Why is that? Because religious insecurity is as much a part of the authentic knowledge of God as religious certainty; "not having" is as crucial as "having"; the outside of the door is as important as the inside. If we dispense with the one, the other is gone as well, no matter how much we protest to the contrary. And why should that be so? Because in the New Testament all these things we prize: salvation, security, possession, joy, freedom, love, peace, realization--all are given in the form of insecurity, always proffered in a way that keeps them on God's terms and not on ours, always in a form which probes and challenges and unsettles. The love of God in Christ, from which of course neither death nor life, nor height nor depth can separate us, is either the burning love of Paul's righteous God who meets us on his own terms rather than on ours--on a cross--or else it is a pious illusion. "On God's own terms"--that is the meaning, in the New Testament, of God's transcendence, and it is utterly pointless to talk of Jesus of Nazareth without it. God's transcendence has very little to do with how much supernaturalism one may or may not be able to display in one's theology; no, it has to do rather with the difference between God's ways and ours. The gospel is always given in the form of our insecurity before God, always with a door slamming on our expectations and claims, for it is only God's terms that make it authentic and sure.

That is, finally, the real reason why authentic religious possession

COUNCIL OF THEOLOGICAL SEMINARIES

By Marcia Myers

terminates in the prayer and worship for which we are assembled here. Not because in this chapel some inner life must be juxtaposed to the outer life of our studies (if your studies engage you only outwardly, how tiresome and dull they must be!) Why Prayer? Because authentic religious security is found only in the God whom we cannot control, before whom we must remain ourselves insecure, ourselves always the petitioners. Real prayer is always prayer to the God of a door that closes and has an outside as well as an inside. And why worship? Because worship is fundamentally nothing else than this! That is all--and yet that is everything! "Yes, and some who are now last will be first, and some who are first will be last." Let us pray: Heavenly Father, who hast sent thy Son into the world to open the door to the knowledge and love of thee, help us to enter that door. Renew us, we beseech thee, by thy life-giving Spirit, by the presence with us and to us of thine own power to give life--so that we may as true worshippers worship thee in truth, as thou truly art--and so that we may pray to thee as we ought to pray, who knowest and searchest the hearts of humankind. In Jesus' name. Amen.

** Rev. Dr. Paul W. Meyer is the Helen H. P. Manson Professor of New Testament Literature and Exegesis. If comments submitted to Viewpoint are in any way accurate, Dr. Meyer's sermon stands among the best--if not the best--sermons given this year. We thank him for allowing this sermon to be the second in the Viewpoint series of introductions to the many new "faces" on campus. Dr. Willis will be introduced in an interview next issue.

I was fortunate to be the Princeton student representative to the annual meeting of The Council of Theological Seminaries last month in Indianapolis, Indiana. The Council is a part of the organizational structure of The United Presbyterian Church, reporting directly to the General Assembly, with administrative relationships with the General Assembly Mission Council and the Vocation Agency. It has a director with offices in The Interchurch Center in New York City. Currently, The Council is searching for a new director following the resignation of Richard Bauer. Each of the seven United Presbyterian seminaries have five representatives on The Council--the seminary president, the dean, a faculty member, a trustee, and a student. P.T.S. was represented by Dr. McCord, Dr. Massa, as dean-elect in the absence of Dean Adams, Dr. Loader, Dr. Frederick Christian, and myself. The Church as a whole is represented by 15 at large members, elected by General Assembly. The Council invites as corresponding members with voice but no vote one U. P. professor from each of four seminaries which have a substantial number of U. P. students, namely, Union, N.Y., Yale, Fuller, and Gordon-Conwell. The Budget and Finance Committee is made up of financial experts from the Church at-large who have no affiliation with any particular seminary. The function of The Council is to relate the work of the seminaries to the needs of the Church and to be the administrative body through which the Church supports the work of the seminaries. That support comes in several ways. The Enlistment and Interpretation Committee of The Council serves to interpret the seminaries and their work to the Church through a variety of public relations efforts. The Budget and Finance Committee allocates United Presbyterian funds to each of the seminaries. P.T.S. receives a large proportion of these

unds (\$645,388 this year which is more than double that allocated to any other seminary). This is due to the fact that P.T.S. has a far greater number of Presbyterian full-time Div. students than any of the other Presbyterian seminaries (497 this year-more than triple the number at any of the other Presbyterian seminaries). The funding matter, coupled with the general air of collegial rivalry within The Council made for some rather pointed "humor" about P.T.S. over meals at the annual meeting.

The role of a student representative to The Council is twofold. The Council meeting provides an excellent opportunity for students to see The Church at work in the area which most directly affects us. Secondly, it is an opportunity for Presbyterian students through representatives to voice concerns which we have about the work of the seminaries and the needs of the Church. In addition to the students representing each of the seven seminaries, there is one student or recent graduate on the executive committee of the Council and one student on the Enrollment and Interpretation Committee. The student committee met prior to the meeting of The Council, participated (without vote) in the events of the meeting, and made its report to The Council. My major criticism of the role of the students is that the representatives serve for only one year, thus most of us came to the meeting with little knowledge of The Council and the issues which would be raised. It is my hope that at least at Princeton, future representatives will have more information from previous years. I feel that the student input this year was responsible and substantial, but with more preparation and continuity, it could be even more so.

This year's theme for discussion was "Evangelism and Mission", most apt for the concerns on our campus and throughout the Church. The opening speaker was The Rev. Brady Allison, U.P.C.U.S.A. Program

Director for Evangelism. In his talk Mr. Allison referred to the challenging results of a recent Gallup poll which showed that more than 50% of the unchurched population in America say they might be interested in church involvement. He charged the seminaries with a major role in responding to this challenge. He stressed that the seminaries must grapple with the faith we have to share, research and develop new ways to communicate the gospel, and find ways of reconciling the polarities which exist in our current understanding and practice of evangelism.

Most of the second day of the meeting was devoted to discussion of the topics. First there was a stimulating panel discussion of four valuable papers dealing in various ways with evangelism--What is it? Why do we do it? How do we do it? The papers were submitted by Marjorie Suchocki of Pittsburgh, Carl S. Dudley of McCormick, Grayson Tucker, Jr. of Louisville, and by our own Edward Dowey, Jr. Working discussion groups continued to wrestle with the topic and formulate some bits of wisdom which can be synthesized and used in future evangelism conferences on the seminary campuses.

It would be virtually impossible to reiterate all of the significant areas which were touched upon during the business meeting. The overall concern, voiced again and again from various directions, was concern about inadequacies within the present process of preparation for ministry. At the present time only 50% of United Presbyterian candidates under care of presbyteries are attending one of the denominational seminaries. While this trend is occurring, candidates are not coming under care early in their preparation for ministry, so that the Church is placed at a disadvantage in the preparation process and concern is that the result may be candidates who are inadequately prepared for ministry in The Presbyterian Church. This concern led to: 1) a seminary selection study to determine the factors in-

fluencing seminary choice by candidates, 2) a declaration made by The Council regarding the importance of Church-related theological education, 3) new interpretation efforts directed at pastors, Care of Candidates Committees, and candidates, and 4) creative efforts by The Vocations Agency to "bridge the gaps" between the seminaries, candidates, and Care of Candidates Committees.

Another issue raised at the C.T.S. meeting which has been a significant concern on this campus came out in the report of The General Assembly Mission Council. The G.A.M.C. strongly urges the seminaries to examine their investment holdings in light of the policies of The General Assembly regarding investments and ethical concerns. Four areas of concern were specifically mentioned: infant formula manufacturers, South African corporations, stewardship of global resources, and insurance "redlining". Of particular note in this regard is the fact that the General Assembly itself has not as yet directed the sale of any investments out of ethical concerns, but has chosen to utilize the position of stockholder to apply pressure from within.

The following is an edited Student Representative Report to The Council on November 10, 1978. The report was well received and referred to The Executive Committee.

STUDENT REPRESENTATIVES REPORT November, 1978

Previously Raised Issues

A. Seminaries, Candidates & Committees

We intend to request the Vocation Agency to examine the discrepancy and inconsistency among the candidates committees of the presbyteries on:

- a) fulfillment of the requirement of the annual conference with each candidate;
- b) the number of years required to be under care;
- c) the specific courses required for ordination;

- d) the use of psychological testing; and
- e) the inappropriate questioning of candidates about their sexual preference, relationships, and marital status and plans.

B. Human Sexuality

We repeat the request raised in 1976 and 1977 for classes in each of the seminaries dealing with human sexuality, both hetero and homo. In conjunction with the 190th General Assembly's instruction that the church must minister to the homosexual population, and with the seminary's responsibility of preparing students for ministry, we request that the classes offered go beyond the nature of human sexuality to its dynamics for ministry. The ethics course offered by Pittsburgh Theological Seminary, "Human Sexuality," and two ministries offerings at Dubuque Seminary: "Premarital Dynamics and Sexuality" and "Human Sexuality," are models of this preparation. Most of the student bodies are unaware of seminary courses dealing with the nature and ministry of human sexuality at their respective schools. We urge an increased emphasis upon this in the graded curricular offerings.

C. Gender Inclusive Language

We repeat the 1976 and 1977 request that each seminary make a policy statement on the use of sexually inclusive language in worship, class, and official documents. We hope this statement would be printed in the seminary's catalog and given to visiting professors and guest speakers.

We also encourage each seminary community to take an official stance (beyond the student voice) by offering an annual consciousness-raising orientation for new and old students, and incorporating in present core classes the issues of faith images and the power of language.

New Issues

A. General Assembly Worship

We are grateful for the opportunity of student leadership in worship at General Assembly this year, and encourage this practice in the future.

Funds for Meetings

To pray for the hungry while ask God to bless our prime rib emptiness. As a body who meet the Name of Christ and who claim alternate lifestyle as responsible stewards, the Council needs to mine what it is demonstrating by places we meet and the food we eat. We request that the Council alternative facilities for its meetings, such as seminary facilities, churches, and retreat centers. This would not only be a better use of resources, but help expose the Council to different facets of the church and vice versa. *(This concern was shared by many on The Council and as a result, future S meetings will be held on the seven seminary campuses.)

Church Leadership Development

If the seminaries are to be fully responsive to the needs of the church, they must take seriously the needs of small churches with limited resources. Over half of the UPCUSA churches have less than two hundred members, and "smallness" has many positive features for Christians in our complex mass society. Yet consciously or unconsciously, the Church says "small isn't beautiful." Tangible rewards (salary, fringe benefits) are greater for pastors of large congregations and the intangible rewards of status, prominence in church government, etc. go with the large church as well.

This leads to negative effects: 1) for the pastor (especially aged 40-60) who hasn't made it to the position of Senior Pastor of First Church on the Square, so feels a deep sense of failure; and 2) for the small congregations served by a pastor who didn't make it on the ecclesiastical ladder who, with an inferiority complex, provide mediocre leadership. In addition to these pastoral, ethical concerns, the current lack of mobility in the high-status churches leads to the conclusion that the church's emphasis on large congregations must change.

We feel that the seminaries can effect that change by: 1) encouraging the participation of small church pastors in D.Min. programs - not as a stepping stone to a "higher status" position, but as enrichment for the small congregation and the church as a whole; 2) encouraging candidates to consider tent-making and part-time ministries which tend to benefit small congregations; 3) providing more small church pastors as role models for students as field education supervisors and as instructors in practical theology; 4) providing more small church field education placements for students (mission churches, yoked parishes, urban and rural parishes). We realize that many such churches cannot afford to pay field education students so are denied the mutual benefit which field education provides. Therefore, we recommend that the seminaries explore funding, with the support of presbyteries, synods, and the General Assembly (possibly mission funds, since training leaders for mission churches is aiding mission in the future).

We seek to bring an end to the attitude which the seminaries perpetuate that serving large congregations is the most rewarding and admirable role.

D. Minority Professors

Too often the decision whether or not the seminary should hire a professor who is a woman or of an ethnic minority has been linked with percentages of certain types of students within the seminary community. This contradicts the reality that in this day of global concern, all of us need to interact with minority persons and deal with issues facing women, blacks, Latinos, Asians, Native Americans, etc. We urge each of the seminaries to keep this in mind when hiring new faculty persons in an effort to more fully inform faculty and equip students for ministry in whatever particular place and form that takes shape. We request seminaries to increasingly explore possibilities for cross-cultural,

-racial, and -sexual team teaching.

E. Student Recruitment

We affirm the seminaries' commitment to the development of church leadership for American ethnic minority churches as exhibited in the focus on Native Americans at Dubuque, the Latino program at McCormick, the Asian ministries emphasis at San Francisco, the black training program at Johnson C. Smith, and the potential outreach to American Koreans by the Council of Theological Seminaries.

We strongly hope that each of the seven seminaries bears responsibility for our church leadership through an intentional recruiting program that is not based solely on present placement possibilities but with a vision for new church development.

However, we are critical of the segregating effect that arises from the assumption that students of the same race should be trained in the same place to lead churches of their same background. Students of a variety of races need to interact with one another. Whites should not be trained with only white congregations in mind, nor should blacks be trained for leadership of only black churches.

We are aware of the small "market" of recruitable persons from ethnic minorities, and that there is a fine balance between integrating the several student bodies and weakening the specialized programs of the particular seminaries. But the presence of Johnson C. Smith, for example, must not be an escape mechanism for other seminaries not to recruit black students. Nor should we discourage students of other races from attending that seminary.

We hope that the Council will continue to evaluate the composition of each seminary student body, their programs of recruitment, and curricular offerings on ethnic issues, to keep segregation in check and expand our too narrow perception of who should be ministering with particular congregations.

F. Ordination to the Word & Sac.

We request that the Council of Theological Seminaries make the intentional thrust to deal with and clarify the apparently ambiguous nature of ordination to the Word and Sacrament. The seminaries of our denomination need to take a leading role in clarifying this issue to the church, both in theological and denominational terms. There is also a great need in our respective seminaries to support and communicate the idea that all Christians are ministers to one another and to the world, called to use their special gifts in God's service. This ministry is in no way of less importance than that of the ordained clergy.

We thank the Council on Theological Seminaries for considering these issues, and for allowing us the opportunity to provide important input on concerns that are crucial for the church.

Respectively submitted,

Don Patterson, Dubuque
Cindy Maxwell Wakeman, Louisville
Vicky Curtiss, McCormick
Ann Duffy, Pittsburgh
Marcia Clark Myers, Princeton
James Stratton, San Francisco
Tim Cyrus, Johnson C. Smith

** Marcia Clark Myers, an M.Div. senior was P.T.S.'s student representative to the Council of Theological Seminaries. She went through P.T.S. first as a Seminary wife, and her experience in the church is partly reflected in the substance of the Council's report.

Student Government, Social Action,
and Viewpoint wish to thank Tony
and the Dining Service for respecting
the Nestle's boycott.

SEMINARY CONCERNS

-9-

FORUM ON GOSPEL

MISSION AND P.T.S.

By Christine Amjad-Ali

While I heartily agreeing with Mark Carlson that there ought to be dialogue and consideration within the Seminary community about mission, and that such consideration should be done "in its theological context with depth and radiance", I was shocked and distressed, to say the least, by the article itself.

Typically, Mark starts by contrasting three terms: social action, mission, and evangelism, which are apparently to be taken as three separate entities. Yet by non-superficial, theological understanding, evangelism (the preaching of the gospel of Christ) and social action (the doing of the gospel of Christ) are both vital, necessary and important parts of mission. I would have hoped that in a Seminary of PTS' caliber we could move away from the emphasis on this false dichotomy which has torn apart the church in the last 150 years. How do we hope to serve the church by perpetuating this distinction which has been overcome in more theologically thoughtful circles. However, at PTS, it seems we must still fight the old, old wars. This is not a matter of epistemological nit-picking. Mark's use of these words is very important because it gives us a clue as to how he understands (or misunderstands) mission itself.

In the very first paragraph of Mark's article this misunderstanding comes clear in his implicit equating of mission with overseas mission - an interesting phrase 'overseas mission'! It makes one ask overseas from where? The very use of the phrase implies quite clearly that mission is the work of America, or the American church. But mission

is no more the work of the American church than it is the work of the British church, or the Japanese church, or even the Pakistani church for that matter. Mission is always the work of the Church of Christ. It is the sending of Christ's church into the world; sent by God and empowered by the Holy Spirit; sent into the world which also, although in a different sense, belongs to Christ; sent to reveal the Kingdom of God by whatever means and in whatever ways the Holy Spirit directs. Any distortion of this leads either to parochialism or imperialism. Perhaps this is the reason why the chair in mission was changed to a chair in ecumenism, for inevitably, it seems, the word 'mission' conjures up pictures of nineteenth century British and American ladies and gentlemen, venturing out into darkest Africa, Bible in hand, to convert the natives. The problem is that Africa never was 'dark'.

The church of Christ exists in Africa today just as it exists throughout the world. As in the rest of the world it exists in weakness and in strength, in richness and in poverty and sometimes in affluence that is no wealth at all. African churches are not called to consider America as an 'overseas mission situation' anymore than American churches are to consider Africa as an 'overseas mission situation'. but because the African church and the American church are both fully part of the church of Christ, both must be involved in the mission of Christ's church in America and in Africa.

This is true mutuality in mission and a proper and wholistic view of Christian mission. Unfortunately we in the West have for so long been like the Corinthian Christians, who although they were just a foot thought themselves to be the whole body, that we are almost incapable of participating in a truly mutual mission.

'We' must always be the senders, 'they' must always be the receivers. But just **what are we sending from** an America which is "suffering a 'crisis of confidence', 'a crisis of

faith." (as Mark quotes Dr. McCord). It is clear what the Third World thinks we are sending: political and economic presuppositions, which they have historically experienced and are still experiencing, as imperialistic, oppressive and patronizing, and a parochial theology which is totally irrelevant to their own situation and needs.

How, then, can we at PTS be involved in a mutual mission? Let me just pick up one way, an issue that Mark also addressed in his article, that is the presence of international students and faculty at PTS. PTS is right to boast of the number of international students it has, in this it is contributing significantly to the mission of the universal church, and I think, most international students are grateful for this. But mission ought to be mutual, and in this area PTS has, in large measure, failed. For the international students are offering, by their very presence here, a breadth and depth of vision not otherwise available in America. They offer unique insight into their own churches and societies and also into the American church and society, and an unique opportunity for American students to move out of their own provincialism. Sadly the experience of most international students is that the majority of American students have no desire to move out of that provincialism. For this reason international students would like to see more international, and especially Third World, faculty; not to cushion international students against American culture shock, but to bring American students into contact with the world wide church and so further the mission of Christ's church here in America, through PTS.

In conclusion, I would encourage a continuing discussion on mission at PTS, and to the end that such discussion might result in a truer and deeper participation of PTS in the mission of the universal church.

I would also strongly support the appointment of Third World faculty members, especially to the proposed chair of Mission and Evangelism. If this happens we might be surprised to find that we in the West need to receive far more from the church of Christ in the rest of the world that we can possibly give to them.

** Christine Amjad-Ali hails from North Yorkshire, England and is married to Charles (from Pakistan), who, I expect, had some "minor" additions to her article. Certainly she can speak more authoritatively on the international scene than I.

The second half of my article on Mission at PTS will not appear until next issue because of the length of this issue, my article on the campus pastor and because I feel that Christine has some very important things to say (especially in the last two paragraphs). Surprisingly, students, by far, have expressed to me more concern over this issue than any other that has appeared in Viewpoint this year.

Summer Greek

By W.D. Moen

O lord!
Unto You I offer
(prosphero soi)
all the irregular verbs
I shall not parse
successfully
before Your throne
on that final day.
Oh let me remain passive,
opting for grace
in the middle,
declining all nouns,
pronouns,
adjectives and anything
else I can
turn down.
O Lord have mercy,
(kyrie elieson)
no Greek on the
Final; no translations,
just transitions; no
hortatory suggestions,
just the present,
perfect.

REPORT ON THE
TRUSTEE-STUDENT CONSULTATION

After the meeting on the 18th of Nov. of the 5 students, 4 trustees and Dr. McCord, the students thought that a constructive time had been had by all. True, the agenda that had been proposed for the meeting was by-passed, which gave the session more the air of discussion, but the main points that the students has wanted to discuss came through. True, there probably wouldn't be a "Pastor" on campus for another 2 years at least, but it seemed like there would be an opportunity for students to be part of a search committee and for students to contribute to defining the job description. The trustees may have been unaware of the degree to which this question possesses an urgency for students. Doug Nason in particular made clear the significance of this summer's abrupt change in administrative policy represented by the Seminary's request to the Major Mission Fund for the Pastor's salary.

True, the Women's Center's concern that part (or all) of the grant also included in the MMF for "A Program for Woman Seminarians" go toward ministry and advocacy with the women students had been tentatively vetoed by Dr. McCord the day before, but Laurie Ferguson was able to put a well-reasoned analysis of the situation with recommendations into the hands of each of the trustees. True, the Black Studies Proposal, perhaps most "realistically" for an administrative appointment under the Dean of the Seminary, seems to languish in limbo (and the credibility of the student group jeopardized by its lack of a black member), but the general campus concern for a more pluralistic faculty was hit at again as it was in informal discussions back in October. And true, the trustees brought no written materials from their October meeting to the consultation--a request that Dr. McCord at least was aware

of (see the background paper in Nov. 3rd's Viewpoint)--but the trustees did come willing to listen and share, and with a good background grasp of the Seminary's perennial problems with students.

So why was there a good feeling about the meeting? And did this feeling have a substantial base?

Beyond the mixed reports given above, there seemed to be significant advances in 3 or 4 main areas. The first came with Mr. Templeton's very constructive opening remarks, in which he proposed that students join the trustees in working on the essential matter of fund-raising at the Seminary. On the basic level this was to say, quite simply, could the students help in finding donors? As it was developed in later discussion, this concern related to the history of student participation in the seminary's fund-raising efforts, and to factors in the present affecting student loyalty and concern for the well-being of the institution. (More on this below)

The second cause for hope came in the re-affirmation of the agreement made last spring that a particular student have access to the portfolio, under the supervision of Dr. McCord, but with the presence of materials from the United Presbyterian Church's Church and Society committee and the Interfaith Center for Corporate Responsibility. It did not seem likely that the student would take particular investment figures out at the meeting, and in fact it was pledged that any information taken from the session be protected scrupulously from the eyes of other interested investors, although the students felt that they would be trusted to understand something of the enormous complexity and delicacy involved in making judgements on any particular seminary holdings. The issue, as was clarified by the Student Government, was not one of publicizing the portfolio, but rather that of providing responsible student input into its formation. It seemed appropriate in this instance

of numerically limited access that the Student Government treasurer be the designated student.

The third positive development is like unto the one above, and concerned the issue of investment guidelines. We acknowledged that, again, in this area the members of the Finance Committee were the actual experts, and Dr. McCord informed us that he sent copies of the guidelines approved by most other universities to the trustees for their perusal, but, after it was acknowledged that a brief statement of the Board from 1970 was all that we presently had in the way of guidelines, it seemed that the trustees were willing to consider suggestions in this area (see the Student Government bulletin board for a copy of the 1970 statement and proceed further in this Viewpoint for a proposed set of investment guidelines). Obviously, student interest in this area is logically continuous with involvement in the preceding two areas. In the discussion of this question Dr. McCord pointed out that students would be well advised to keep aware of the fact that "liberal" individuals often find themselves trying to direct money actually coming from more conservative sources, and that "liberal orthodoxy" in the area of investments had only recently decreed "shareholder resolutions" to offending corporations despite the present orthodoxy of divestment, though this is not to obscure the progression from ineffective resolutions to somewhat-more-than-symbolic divestment. It was in this area, too, that the question of the Seminary's treasurer came up, as Manufacturer's Hanover has given unrestricted loans to South Africa and has been a target of student interest at the Seminary in the past. Again, the whole issue is very complex, but not unapproachable--which leads us to area four.

This fourth area of advance is less concrete than the previous three, as it has to do with the quality of the interactions between

the two groups and the possibilities for the future. On the discouraging side, no future meeting time was agreed upon, as the trustees have not yet decided where they will have their January meeting. More important though is the form of the next meeting--for the student Government reiterated the trustees' own proposal of 1972 that students be present as observers at their meetings. This would mean that even if reports and material prepared for those meetings were ever made available to the Student Government or body, information would not be substituted for actual presence. Clearly many of the issues in our transaction were repetitive for the trustees, and whether or not the student body will ever be able to consider itself a collective trustee of the seminary in fact remains a question. It was apparent to the Student Government representatives that all of those within the body of this admittedly "pro-teen" trustee had real investments in this place, and that the crucial factor in their/our relation to the budget and the upbuilding of the seminary on all levels was the amount of responsibility that the students had been given/that had been recognized. On the symbolic level, of course, student-trustee involvement continues to affect student morale.

On the positive side of this fourth area, though, are our very consultation represented a change from the monological language of power (that some feared). Further, the trustees indicated that they both wished to get to know students more, and that their random seating in the cafeteria was often unproductive of meaningful conversation (on areas relating to the seminary's direction or policies). It seems clear to us at least that both an education and a witness are being lost here--and that this institution is in this way less than the sum of its parts. As is indicated by the proposed guidelines and article following, the work of the trustees represents an

educational dimension lacking in our present structure. As ministers almost all of us will be dealing with financial matters in the future. It is the Seminary's responsibility, we would maintain, to set a responsible example and to make clear to those interested at least what is required. So, we ask not only "when can we meet again?" but (presuming that this will occur if not at the trustee meeting -- by early next semester) "can we proceed to some serious involvement?" (perhaps during this upcoming January meeting).

Participants in the Consultation:
 Mr. John Templeton (chair)
 Dr. Bryant Kirkland
 Dr. John Galloway
 Dr. Clifford Pollock
 Dr. James McCord
 Mr. Christian Iosso
 Mr. Richard McDermott
 Mr. John Hogman
 Ms. Laurie Ferguson
 Mr. Douglas Nason

"For South Africa"

By Elsie A. McKee

Tension.
 Multifaceted
 Sign of life, bane of existence.
 Spirit of Grace, disturbing our
 complacence,
 Shattering the mirror of our self-
 regarding worry,
 Breaking in with piercing gift--
 It is an unjust world: we are un-
 fairly blessed.
 Forgive us.
 Oh, shake us loose from private
 pity, indulging every minor
 woe.
 Make us that beyond our power:
 humble, loving, Christ-like...
 Yours.
 And theirs.

** Elsie McKee is a Ph.D. student in the department of Church History and the daughter of African missionaries.

THE CAMPUS PASTOR DEBATE

By Mark Carlson

The minutes of the November 29 Seminary Conference note: "During the course of the discussion (of another subject), it became clear that significant confusion of anticipation (of the campus pastor job description) possible, e.g., whether the position should be analogous to that of a parish minister, a college chaplain, or a pastoral counselor." Indeed, the discussion was intense and very significant.

Dr. Conrad Massa incisively fingered the cause of the problem. He pointed out that the job description of an average pastor usually found its substance in items like baptizing babies, burying the dead, visiting the sick and shut-in, preaching every Sunday, running youth group(s), organizing committees. Obviously a campus pastor to PTS would have virtually nothing to do with any of these except perhaps the last. What then is this phantom "campus pastor?"

It was made extremely clear that "college chaplain" is not the aim. The administration certainly does not want a miniature William Sloane Coffin bantering around and waving flags. I doubt that most others would find such antics the aim of the campus pastor.

Coke McClure suggested, if I read him correctly, essentially a pastor role model. The individual presumeably would preach and "shepherd" the community. The specific content of the job appeared somewhat ambiguous to me and, perhaps partly due to my own imagination, I feared that the campus pastor under this "role model for ministry" title might degenerate into a mere father figure to be copied and emulated, and to feel "pastored" by. Admittedly there is a crisis in the identity of the minister but I doubt that hiring "a model" will resolve it. A variety of models already exist on campus and I am not sure that the specific services of this "type" are

of a sufficiently critical nature.

After these two suggestions, Lois Ann Wasson reported that it was her impression from discussion with other students that a substantial portion of the job description should be pastoral counseling. She and many others thought this to be the central purpose of bringing a pastor to campus. (obviously the job description would entail more than counseling: we need a full-time walk-in therapist about as much as a beneficent shepherd).

It was immediately pointed out that this "feeding" to supposed counseling desires tends to escalate in seminaries and never seems satiable: hire one counselor and counseling "needs" double. However true this observation may be, it must also be observed that, below a certain capacity, to not hire another counselor is to operate on a de facto triage system. Only, the reason for turning away people in need would not be due to an inescapable lack of supplies but the idea that Princeton is an educational, rather than a therapeutic, institution. That idea is also true but it must realize that education at seminary is incomparably different from undergraduate or even medical or law school. At seminary it is the person's very faith and "life-root" that is being tested, bombarded, and, at very least, significantly restructured, while at medical school such ultimate questions are more peripherally encountered. At seminary, our hearts, minds, and soul are on the operating table; at medical school usually someone else's body is.

Turning from a report on positions expressed by individuals at seminary conference, I report on the five point stance of student government set forth to me:

(1) "Unless students start thinking clearly about a job description and about the reasons why past generations of students pushed for this pastor, the person so designated will be either non-existent or unrecognizable.

(2) "Unless at least one particular individual is considered for the job, the usual stop-gap, part-time and half-qualified people will try to fill the position.

(3) "The position must not be seen as a panacea: the person might even become a scapegoat. In no way should this person be used as a placebo, for instance, to gloss over structural problems at the seminary that the root of constant difficulties. The problems will not all go away -- and it's wrong to reduce them merely to individual "personal" problems.

(4) "The use of this person as a role model raises the question of his/her symbolic function. We find it quite possible that the person be a pastoral model and devote much of his/her time to the necessary pastoral counseling. The word "pastor" may be less embarrassing to the institution than other alternatives but should be properly understood to signify whatever community functions are involved.

(5) "Present middlers and juniors must stay on top of this matter so that two years from now groundwork will have been done, and students will not be ignored when someone is 'gotten for' them."

Student government position #3 is perhaps a good way to end this report. The campus pastor should not be used as a 'solution' for problems which may be socio-structural. That is perpetuating a sick system rather than curing it. Neither should it be assumed that the campus pastor - whatever it is - will be "the" solution. The problem may be far greater than one person can handle. It may even be possible that the implementation of such a position may be a less-than-adequate or inappropriate approach to the campus "problem" -- whatever it is. Getting a campus pastor in the Major Mission Fund proposal is far from being "home free": we have just stepped into the batter's box.

PROPOSED GUIDELINES FOR INVESTMENT POLICY

The principle task of the Seminary is to educate men and women for Christian ministry. The functioning of the Seminary as an institution requires capital resources well in excess of those directly paid by its students. It is the specific task of the Finance Committee to procure and maintain such funds. This is accomplished by attempting to maximise investment returns, achieve capital growth and by protecting the safety of investments.

The Seminary is careful to always observe the terms of each gift and bequest it accepts and to honour the intentions of the donor. Wherever such specifications are lacking, the committee pursues a flexible policy in order to achieve superior investment performance. Hence, the proportion of common stocks may, at times, vary between 20% and 90%. Likewise, superior securities may be sought in many nations.

The Finance Committee of the Seminary has a special role in regard to its investment policy. That is, it must be guided first of all, by theological considerations as it seeks to be faithful to its mission in bearing witness to the Lordship of Jesus Christ and works towards the upbuilding of the material and spiritual welfare of humanity. Secondly, it must be guided by prudent business practice if it is to survive in a complex and competitive world. Hence, the Seminary determines to pursue an investment policy which insures a sound economic future and yet which is cognisant of the social responsibilities inherent in its corporate investments. **Acknowledging** this tension between investment yield and corporate responsibility, the Seminary has adopted the following guidelines to inform all of our investment decisions:

- I. To avoid investments in corporations wherein:
 - A. there is the manufacture or sale of products or by-products which are linked to health hazards; or where the wasteproducts are not disposed of in an ecologically responsible manner.
 - B. the production of weapons, especially those which do not permit a distinction between civilian and combatant, is a primary enterprise.
 - C. discrimination is practiced or tolerated on the basis of age, sex, race or sexual orientation: whether as deliberate policy or inadvertently, both here and abroad.
 - D. their operations lend economic support or moral legitimacy, whether intentionally or inadvertently, to regimes which deny human rights, as defined by the U.N. Charter on Human rights, to their citizens.
 - E. the refusal to acknowledge the right of labour to organize and maintain unions is practised.
- II. To actively seek investment in endeavours which are beneficial to the general welfare and are thus in the Seminary's interest, even if the Seminary nets less investment yield. For example:
 - A. enterprises which foster the economic development of minorities and the poor.
 - B. corporations engaged in developing products or resources which curb or do not cause environmental damage.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that a committee on investment responsibility be established, consisting of three students and one faculty member. The committee would be granted access to the portfolio early in the year and would meet later in the year with a member of the Finance Committee. The specific task of the committee on investment responsibility would be to review the corporations in which the Seminary holds securities, to inquire into their policies and practises on

the aforementioned concerns. In case of violation, it would recommend appropriate action such as: initiating shareholder resolutions, participating in shareholder litigations to compel specified action, or in some cases, divestment from such holdings. The committee would also assist in seeking and evaluating affirmative investment opportunities such as those mentioned in article "II" above. The committee's actions would be subject to certain regulations, mutually agreed upon, to insure that the fiduciary responsibility of the Finance Committee is not violated.

** The above is the first step in the negotiation of student government with the Board of Trustees over guidelines for seminary investment.

A BRIEF COMMENTARY ON THE GUIDELINES

By Chris Iosso

In emulation perhaps of Dr. Dowey's Commentary on the Confession of 1967, I would like to comment on certain of the theological and financial considerations lying behind these proposed guidelines. The basic document was written by David Hoffman, a policy and issue coordinator for the Government and its representative from the International Students Assoc. It was revised and reworked in a special committee by Mark Davidson, Gary Dorrien, and Charles Amjad-Ali, and then amended and approved by the Student Government. Theological considerations were seen as basic, and among these the idea that there is no such thing as neutrality in the world was extremely important. A totally "clean" portfolio is probably impossible, and possibly inadvisable, due to the inextricable connections of all corporations to multinational structures of exploitation. Thus, the guidelines were written not to

stand as an "impossible ideal", but to be practical and sufficiently general rules of thumb. At the same time, the arguments concerning neutrality that have often occupied secular universities do not hold for us... We are an arm of the church and as such an institution committed to stand against all forms of injustice and untruth. Obviously, we have no desire to tie the hands of the Finance Committee and have produced a much simpler document than the United Presbyterian Church's document of 1971. Readers of both, however, will notice considerable similarity of language.

The second major theological principle upon which the guidelines are based, after an emphasis on the link between faithfulness and financial integrity, is a very Reformed understanding of the third use of the Law, or the law as a guide. The guidelines stipulate certain negative provisions or limits, as one would expect, but they also contain some positive suggestions and the idea that our portfolio may testify to the faith that is in us. Simon, Powers, and Gunnemann in their book, The Ethical Investor, call this the "programmatic" in contrast to the qualified "income-producing" function of the investments (p.160). A Biblical warrant, were one explicitly needed, might be found in Matt. 7:21, "For where your treasure is, there will your heart be also." The point at which the guidelines seemed to us to bear the most similarity to the Confession of 1967, though, was in the acknowledgement that at some points our choice of lesser evils might lead to lesser profits. This seemed reminiscent of the phrases in C-67, Part II, under Reconciliation in Society, where the church is to back "responsible relations across every (international) line of conflict, even at risk to national security..."

Would this mean in practical terms that our tuition would go up? Perhaps, though this question takes us into questions of what percentage of our portfolio's earnings are being

hanneled into the present operations of the Seminary, and also relates to Mr. Templeton's question as to what students can do to help in meeting the Seminary's budget. We trust that the trustees will have all seen the material in this issue of Viewpoint and we have asked that the guidelines and our proposals concerning further Student-Trustee interaction be on theocket at the Trustee's January meeting. In the financial area just mentioned, that of fund-raising, students are quite ready to go ahead--if they are given guidance and information by the Board and by President McCord on the necessities of Seminary finance. John Hogman, in particular, has volunteered to provide an analysis of what can be done specifically by students, if we are provided with data on present fund-raising patterns. Obviously, our involvement on this level would well complement out interest in where the Seminary's monies are invested.

* Students might be interested in reading an article on John Templeton that appears in the November 27, 1978 issue of Forbes. A representative quotation might be the following: "Forbes, which has interviewed them all, considers John Templeton to be one of the handful of true investment greats in a field crowded with mediocrity and bloated reputations." Another article for those interested in the work of the Interfaith Center for Corporate Responsibility and the mechanics of shareholder resolutions is found in the October 11, 1978 issue of The Saturday Review. See the Student Government Board for both articles.

FIELD EDUCATION PLACEMENT CHANGES PROPOSED FOR SPRING

The Field Education staff, together with the Students' Advisory Committee to Field Education, have developed a new approach to the Spring

Placement procedures. They would like any response to these from the student body.

The existing procedure has been for pastors to come to the Campus and for students to sign up for interviews. Three weaknesses in this approach have been identified:

1. Because all placement descriptions have to be gathered by mail, many have not been available prior to the pastor's visit to campus.
2. The student does not get to see the potential field of service and makes a decision based on the pastor's presentation. This has sometimes made the student's first visit to the field in September something of a shock!
3. Lay members of the church are not usually involved. But a major difficulty with Field Education arises when the official board or congregation does not understand the educational aspects.

The new procedures suggested are as follows:

1. Early in March pastors and lay people would come to the Campus for orientation and discussion with the staff, some students, and one another in regard to the purpose and procedures of good field education. Placement descriptions would be completed at this time. This would give some pastors and laypeople who have never seen the Campus an opportunity to do so.
2. Interview dates would be established and interviews would take place at the Church with the pastor and at least a couple of laypeople. The students who sign up for a particular interview session could car pool. We would hope each Church would set two different times for interviews.
3. Placement descriptions would be available for students to review during the week of March 12, 1979 (the week prior to Spring Recess) and thereafter. Interviews would be from March 26 through April 27, 1979.

Advantages to the proposed procedure would be:

1. Better education of pastors and laity.

UNTITLED

By Sue Reisinger

Just after I returned to school last January I was in the dining hall eating lunch with a group of friends. A man I didn't know walked into the room. He began talking very loudly, saying he was the prophet Elijah, Jesus Christ, the AntiChrist. He went on and on for almost five minutes. Then, he was escorted out of the dining hall. As he left those of us in the room sighed with relief, and began to laugh - he was crazy! No one spoke with him, except to ask him to leave. My thoughts-

The prophet enters, his eyes flash fire as his peircing glances dart from person to person.

His head swings like it's not attached, his hands trace circles in the air.

He's the prophet Elijah, the theological wiz-kid, the husband of 1,000 women.

This guy must be crazy - (we don't have to pay much attention).

After all, I would know a prophet if I met one - (or would I?)

My eyes follow his course, stealing glances, afraid to meet his eyes. What if he should ask me one of his absurd questions?

I take a bite of my food as his devouring eyes turn in my direction.

I don't want to get involved with you!

What would I do with a person like you?

We listen or refuse to listen, but we don't hear

We look, or refuse to look, but we don't see.

We are unable to deal with this man.

He is ushered out of our presence, an unwanted specter of something buried deep inside us.

He leaves rejected, unwanted, not understood.

We laugh, Lord -

Could all these antics of his be his way of laughing at us?

Could his laughter have the same meaning as ours?

Our world makes as little sense to him as his world makes to us.

Perhaps a prophet after all, Lord

So, we leave, rejected, unwanted, not understood.

Lord, as we laugh, hear him, see him, love him Lord for we do not know how.

Cont. from page 17-

2. Students would have opportunity to review many placement descriptions before deciding on interviews.

3. Students would see the place of service and meet members of the congregation as well as the pastor.

The major disadvantage to the procedure change is that the student would need to travel to each interview separately. Students on the Advisory Committee feel that the advantages more than outweigh this inconvenience.

The Field Education Department
would be happy to receive any writ-
ten reactions to this proposal.
Please use the tear-off sheet on the back page and leave it at the Field Education Office or in the Viewpoint Box. **

REACTION TO FIELD EDUCATION PROPOSAL

Good idea!

Have reservations or questions as follows:

Don't like it because:

No signature necessary. Please return to Viewpoint box or the
Field Education Office by Tuesday, January 9, 1979.

